The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1930 NUMBER 805

Contents

The Week 309

Editorials

The Utilities as an Issue 311
The Alternatives in India 313
The Radio and the Press 314

General Articles

The World's Future Population ..... Robert R. Kuczynski 315
Can They Smoke Like Gentlemen? .. Frances Perkins 319
Time Is a Flower on the Sea (verse) ..... Harold Lewis Cook 320
Religion and the Soviets ..... H. N. Brailsford 321
Hard Times for Farmers: II .... Roland R. Renne 323
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 325
Hotel Universe ..... Stark Young 326

Correspondence 327

Reviews of Books

The Grain of Things ..... Lewis Mumford 331
A Beam of Light ..... Babette Deutch 332
Tidings from London ..... Howard Coxe 333
Anthologies, Good and "Bad" ..... Conrad Aiken 333
Rupert Hughes' Washington .... John Hyde Preston 334
A Dull Series ..... Isidor Schneider 334
Notes on Novels 335

The Week

FOR THE second time, President Hoover has warned Congress that a large deficit impends if all the bills carrying appropriations, now pending before Congress, are passed. He admits that many of the extra appropriations not contained in the budget are necessary for carrying on the government; indeed, the largest of these was the $100,000,000 addition to the funds of the Farm Board, Mr. Hoover's own creature. But he points out the cold conflict between income and outgo, and places upon Congress the responsibility for doing something about it. This situation again reveals the folly of the administration in reducing income taxes this year, and especially in reducing the corporation tax, in view of the huge profits made by business in 1929. The companies which had the largest earnings, and hence would have had to pay the most taxes, are not and have not been hard pressed for money; their surplus accounts are ample and they have not had to resort even to ordinary bank credit in any great degree. If they have done so, the state of the money market has made commercial borrowing easy. It was far less important to give them the slight and little-needed relief of tax reduction, than to make sure that the federal government had ample funds to meet the exigencies of depression—which bear hardest, of course, on the propertyless.

THE nomination of and opposition to Judge Parker as a candidate for the Supreme Court has had one extremely fortunate outcome—it has dramatized the injustice of the yellow-dog contract, and through that, the broader scope of the bill regulating anti-labor injunctions prepared by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. This bill is not, as stated in the news dispatches, a brand-new one produced in the heat of the present excitement. It was drawn months ago, with great care and after extensive consultation with competent legal scholars. It resulted from the long struggle of organized labor and public-spirited lawyers against the abuse of labor injunctions. Two years ago, Senator Shipstead introduced an anti-injunction bill which was endorsed by labor—a bill which good legal opinion opposed as both tending to injustice and likely to be invalidated by the courts. The present measure is a substitute for the Shipstead bill, and there is good reason to believe it could be made effective. We should remember that to limit the use of the labor injunction would involve no radical upset of long established tradition. The injunctions to which labor rightfully objects are a phenomenon mainly of the last quarter-century; they are an American innovation which is not paralleled in the judicial practice of any other nation which shares the heritage of the English common law. We hope the bill will be speedily enacted. If President Hoover and other backers of Judge Parker want to prove that in supporting him they are not really hostile to labor on this issue, they can find no better way of doing so than to get behind the present effort to clarify and improve the law of the injunction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO incidents stand out in the week's budget of news about prohibition. Federal agents have arrested eleven men in a New York restaurant for carrying pocket flasks; and the committee of the United States Senate which is investigating lobbying has voted to suppress a list, prepared by anti-prohibitionists, of members of Congress who are known to drink although they are professional Drys. The New York raid, of course, had no relation to real enforcement. The Treasury experts have repeatedly told us that this is to be obtained, if at all, only by striking at the source of supply. Diners out in New York, like those in many other cities, have for years habitually used pocket flasks; it is probable that ten thousand equally guilty men went unpunished on the night when the unlucky eleven were haled to court. It is hard to resist the conclusion that this raid was carried out in order to satisfy Middle Western prohibitionists who dislike New York and New Yorkers on several grounds, and have been demanding that a demonstration be made in the metropolis. Such a futile and inadequate gesture is as hypocritical as was the hasty concealing of the names of the Wet-Dry legislators. How can the people of the country maintain respect for a law which is made a mockery by those sworn to carry it out?

IN ITS annual report for 1929, the Federal Reserve Board reveals publicly for the first time that early in that year it vetoed the decision of several of the Reserve Banks to raise rediscount rates. Many believe that had rates been raised early enough and drastically enough, inflation in the stock market would have been checked and the crash might have been avoided. The Board, however, was afraid to sanction the increases because of their possible effect on general business, and attempted to substitute a method of "direct action"—it warned the banks against expanding their loans on securities, on pain of having their credit curtailed at the Reserve Banks. This action, it is admitted, was not wholly successful. Certainly it did not avert stock-market inflation. And, just as certainly, general business ran into a depression without any influence from interest rates, before the market crash arrived. One wonders, after the event, whether sharp increases in the rediscount rate would really have injured business very much, or whether, if they had retarded business expansion, such retardation might not have helped to prevent the subsequent industrial depression as well as the Wall Street debacle.

GOVERNOR Roosevelt, in his treatment of the bills passed by the New York State Legislature to improve the regulation of public utilities, took one action which clarifies the situation greatly. He vetoed the measure providing for a public representative, appointed by the Attorney-General, to support the consumers' interest in proceedings before the Public Service Commission. This function, the Governor pointed out, belongs to the Commission itself. The Public Service Commission is not, and should not be considered, a judicial body before which the utilities and the consumers respectively come to plead their cases as before a neutral. It is really an extension of the power of the legislature to regulate rates and service. The legislature can do this as a matter of right, because the utilities are natural monopolies and derive franchise and other privileges from the public authority. This exercise of the power of the state is by its nature and purpose a protection of the consumer, rather than a judicial proceeding. The Commission ought, to be sure, to exercise its power with judicious consideration for the rights of utility owners, but its decisions on behalf of the consumer ought not, in the normal run of affairs, to be questioned by the utilities. Any citizen can, of course, appeal to the courts when he thinks legislative or executive acts infringe his constitutional rights, and utilities can do the same. But the usual process of regulation ought not to involve litigation any more than does any ordinary exercise of the police power —such, for example, as regulating automobile traffic on the public highways. The Public Service Commission was created in the first instance to protect the public, and its police function should be placed uppermost.

ON JANUARY 10, 1929, flogging was abolished in those government boarding schools which Indian children are forced to attend after being separated from their parents. Together with crowding, underfeeding and overwork, it was one of the abuses from which these children had long suffered. Better things were hoped for in the future. On March 20 of this year, however, flogging seems to have been reëstablished—or such, at least, is the obvious conclusion to be drawn from Circular 2666 of the Office of Indian Affairs. This document, signed by Commissioner C. J. Rhoads and directed to superintendents of Indian boarding schools, is to be recommended as an example of official circumlocution. It says nothing whatever about flogging. It says, however, that responsibility for choosing "methods of control" should be placed "personally on the superintendents"—the same superintendents, in most cases, who held office in 1928, when it was testified that in many schools the most brutal punishments were being inflicted on the children.

MILDER measures are now recommended. "Punishment," says Commissioner Rhoads, who seems to be unacquainted with the tendency of modern education away from any use at all of punishment, "should never be inflicted except as a possible means of reformation. . . . Instead of the jail formerly maintained by some schools, a 'quiet room' should be provided . . . not accessible to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other students nor to employees except on permission of the superintendent . . . . If the measures suggested or similar ones fail to bring about satisfactory results, *superintendents are authorized to adopt such emergency measures as may in their judgment be thought necessary.*" These words, which we have italicized, bode ill for the Indian children. Applying a strap to their bare backs used to be called a flogging. If it is now to be described as an "emergency measure," what difference does it make to the boys and girls who are flogged? And, if they are once more to be kept in solitary confinement, what do the Indian children care whether the place of punishment is called a jail or merely a "quiet room"?

BY A decision rendered at Philadelphia in a case involving the right of Communists to become American citizens, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals has set an extremely dangerous precedent. The case was that of John Tapolscanyi, a barber of Harmony, Pennsylvania, who had taken out his final naturalization papers in 1920. Afterwards, however, he made the mistake of telling his brother in Hungary that he was "a Communist in principle." His letter was intercepted by the Hungarian censors. As a brotherly act, they turned it over to the American authorities, who thereupon instituted proceedings to cancel his citizenship. Tapolscanyi testified in court to his belief that one of the cardinal points of the Constitution is evolution, including the right of a citizen peaceably to work for a change of government. He was, so he said, ardently attached to this principle, and "in imposing his Communistic ideas upon this country he intended to work strictly in the manner the Constitution provided." The appellate court answered, with one of those legal distinctions that are so difficult for laymen to understand, that only a citizen was privileged to work for the evolution of the Constitution, whereas Tapolscanyi was a Communist *before* he was naturalized. It upheld the action of the district court in revoking his citizenship.

ITS decision points to three conclusions. First, even though the Communist party has a legal existence in this country—even though it is allowed to nominate candidates for state and national offices—no Communists will henceforth be permitted to become American citizens. Second, naturalized citizens who are members of this party can retain their citizenship only if they can prove that they were good capitalists at the moment of naturalization. Third, if they cannot prove this, the government can have their citizenship revoked, thus opening the way to their eventual deportation for any one of those offenses which the police are so skilled in fabricating. Thus, the Circuit Court of Appeals has furnished a new and effective weapon to the Red-hunters—who have by no means lacked for weapons in the past.

The Utilities as an Issue

BY A radio speech, by his comments in vetoing or signing bills presented to him by the legislature and by an address at the Jefferson Day dinner of the Democratic party, Governor Roosevelt of New York has amply shown his intention of making a major political issue out of public-utility control. This fact is lent an added importance, at least on the surface, by the suggestion of Senator Wheeler of Montana at the Jefferson dinner that Mr. Roosevelt would make an excellent presidential candidate with this as his chief plank.

We do not take too seriously the movement to make Mr. Roosevelt the Democratic presidential nominee in 1932. He has been nursing his health ever since his unfortunate illness; he accepted the nomination for the Governorship of New York with a good deal of reluctance on this account. While he is doubtless well on his way to full vigor, it is hardly to be supposed that he would actively seek the terrific punishment of a campaign for nomination and election to the White House, to be followed, if successful, by at least four years of physical and nervous strain—a severe burden even for the most robust. Moreover, Mr. Roosevelt is not the sort of man whose guiding star is an ambition for office, and who casts about for some unappropriated issue in order to further his own prospects.

The situation, as we see it, is quite different from this. In carrying on Al Smith's attempt to curb the rapidly growing power of the private utilities and increase the welfare of the people of New York state, Mr. Roosevelt has enlisted in a fight which is far from finished. It is one which fully absorbs his conscience and intelligence, and one in which he has encountered a most stubborn and resourceful opposition. The domain of the utility interests is not a Jericho which will fall if we merely march around its wall and blow a trumpet. If the Governor is not to be defeated in this struggle, he must make an issue of it; for he must have public understanding and support. He must be able either to count on a legislature which shares his views, or to dominate a hostile legislature because of a popular mandate which it fears. The election of 1930 in New York state is his real objective.

For an excellent reason, it is well that this should be so. The states must play a large part in any effective dealing with such things as electric, telephone, gas and water companies—a much larger part than history has permitted them in the regulation of steam railroads. For by far the greater portion of the business of these companies is, and must remain, local in nature. It is true that their physical interconnections and their financial affiliations increasingly cross state boundaries, and will probably require some form of federal control, but it is difficult to conceive of effective federal measures in this field which do not rest on adequate state regulation—or on some state substitute for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regulation. New York holds a key position in this matter; if it can work out a good system, its example will be influential elsewhere. What Mr. Roosevelt is able to do in New York is therefore truly of national importance.

A warning which has appeared in various quarters, that Mr. Roosevelt must be careful lest in raising this issue he make a demagogic appeal, strikes the very depths of the ridiculous. We wish the banners of the proletariat did indeed bear slogans like "Give us valuation on the basis of prudent investment or give us death!" or "Depreciation reserves must *not* be included in the rate base!" or "We will not pay an 8-percent return on bond issues as well as on common stock!" But, as one of a group of publications and individuals which has been for several years trying to impress upon the public the importance of the issue and to explain its ramifications, The New Republic knows that this way lies no cheap and easy appeal to the mob. To untangle the skein of accounting verbiage and legal subtleties with which the utilities have surrounded themselves is no easy task even for the expert; to explain these matters for the benefit of the most attentive readers is far from simple; but to rouse an electorate to emotion about them would require the genius of a Pythagoras coupled with the tongue of a Demosthenes. Besides this issue, things like the gold standard or the tariff, about which former and more leisurely generations of voters got excited, are mere Fourth Reader material.

We should, for instance, be greatly surprised if, after reading Mr. Roosevelt's recent comments, the casual newspaper purchaser could give a clear account of precisely why he signed the bills providing for more control over the practices of holding companies and other non-affiliated concerns, and for a larger staff for the Public Service Commission, while he vetoed the majority bill for a revaluation of the utilities' properties on the basis of present value, to be followed by attempts to make contracts with them as to the calculation of the rate base for a limited period. The Governor could have chosen no more difficult ground for his campaign, nor could he have picked a better prepared or more amply financed opponent. There is no good reason for the choice of this ground and this opponent, except a conviction that here lies his greatest opportunity for public service.

Likewise it is foolish to suppose that the problem of utility regulation will be "worked out" in some obscure way by professors, lawyers, accountants, commissioners and courts, in the absence of a vigorous and informed demand for justice on the part of the consumer-voters. Those who now control the utilities are in it for the power and money they can extract from them; there is no sign that they will surrender a single cent or a single position for conscience' sake, and they are far from being frightened by any opposition they have yet encountered. More than any other ruling powers of the modern capitalist order, they have been successful in getting away with everything they have wanted. Their friends are in high places, they have mountainous resources of money and talent. The fact that they opposed even the moderate and almost meaningless reforms proposed by the Republican legislative group in New York, who had hitherto failed to cause them the slightest annoyance, indicates how unconscious they are that they might be vulnerable.

And yet we do not believe that Mr. Roosevelt has espoused a hopeless cause. Slowly we are getting the facts of the situation, the issue is being defined by inquiry after inquiry. Householders who add up their yearly bills for gas, electricity, telephone, and the rest, are becoming quite conscious that this is a sizeable part of the budget, and that changes in rates do matter. More and more persons are learning that where the utilities are under proper ownership or control, their services are materially cheaper, and permit the use of modern conveniences like gas heating or electric cooking, which are now impossible for many. Telephone subscribers who read of the large profits rolled up by the parent A. T. & T. cannot understand why local companies should continually press for higher rates—not on the basis of operating costs, but on the basis of mysterious accounting which involves endless litigation at enormous expense. They are beginning to see the absurdity in arguments that rates should be higher—or lower—according as the price of copper changes from month to month. And they are beginning to understand the dangerous ramifications of the power exercised or sought by these great aggregations of capital through influence over commissions, courts, legislators, Cabinet officers, and even Presidents. We hope only that they become concerned enough over these matters so that men like Mr. Roosevelt can make some headway. We hope the issue does become political in the best sense of the word. For this is certainly a case where society cannot be protected except through government—political government with its democratic implications—as opposed to the feudalistic industrial government which is now in the saddle.

The Alternatives in India

THE situation in India is following the expected lines, and moving toward ever deeper tragedy. A considerable number of persons have already been killed—it is impossible to say just how many, because news-gathering facilities are inadequate and there is every reason to believe that the censorship is at work. Indeed, the Viceroy, Lord Irwin, announced on April 27 that the native press would be subjected to "control"—and everyone knows what that means. At any moment, an outbreak may occur which will bring back the conditions of the Indian Mutiny of 1857. Mahatma Gandhi is still opposed to violence; he continues to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

put all reliance upon his campaign of civil disobedience, and his influence over his followers is extraordinary; but there are many thousands who do not acknowledge his authority, and even among those who do, there can be but one final response to the violent measures which the British are now beginning to employ. There can be no doubt that the situation in India is more fraught with the possibilities of disaster than anything since the outbreak of the Great War.

Many Americans who are in close sympathy with the general aims of the British Labor government are puzzled to understand the seeming apathy of Mr. MacDonald and his followers toward the danger of a world-shattering explosion in India. It cannot be laid to ignorance, for the Labor party for many years made effective campaign ammunition of the treatment of the Indian question by previous Tory or Liberal governments; Mr. MacDonald has himself visited India and is the author of two books on the subject. It is true that the Labor government has only a minority in Parliament, and that its strength has been still further depleted recently by the formal defection of the Independent Labor party; but if the Indian situation is as serious as it appears to be, and as expert observers like Mr. Andrews, Mr. Brailsford and Mr. Ratcliffe assert it is, a time-serving policy toward it is now as fatal as any other. It is the habit to explain that any new government in England is at the mercy of the permanent staff in the Indian Office, which knows all the ropes and goes its own way; but affairs are now at a stage where no subordinate official would dare to take action on his own initiative. Undoubtedly, the key to the government's failure to act can be found in two things: reluctance to yield under pressure, which is connected with the question of "imperial prestige" throughout the world; and the probability that in this crisis, Mr. MacDonald and his advisers are at a loss to know what is the best thing to do.

It will be remembered that on Nov. 1, 1929, Lord Irwin, on behalf of the government, made a declaration promising ultimate Dominion status, and proposing a conference to discuss the whole question. This conference was to take place after the Simon commission's report had been made public, and was to be based upon that document. Subsequent debate in the British Parliament, however, caused the Indians to feel that the pledge of Dominion status was not to be taken seriously. They therefore made several demands on the Viceroy as a condition to participating in the proposed round-table conference. They wanted a definite pledge that the conference would proceed immediately to draw up a constitution for Dominion status; they asked amnesty for all political prisoners; they proposed that members of the Indian National Congress should have predominant representation in the proposed conference, and they requested some evidence of a real change of heart among the British representatives. When the Viceroy failed to announce his categorical acceptance of these terms, Mr. Gandhi, with the backing of a majority of the National Congress, set the date for the beginning of his campaign of non-violent non-coöperation, which he has symbolized so dramatically by his march to the sea, where he manufactured salt in violation of the government's monopoly.

There are only three possible choices confronting the British government today. It can set India free; it can grant Dominion status; or it can appeal to the sword. Whatever we may think of the desirability of complete freedom for India, it is at the present moment a political impossibility. Great Britain may yield something under pressure, but it is fantastic to suppose that she will yield as much as that in one sudden act. The extensive use of armed force, on the other hand, would plunge all India into a bath of blood, it would be accompanied by the moral reprobation of the whole civilized world, it would lay intolerable burdens on the British taxpayer, and it would have an outcome exceedingly dubious and not to be foreseen.

There remains, then, Dominion status as a logical step on the road to complete independence. It is true that Dominion status has been hinted at, ever since 1917, and was definitely promised by the Viceroy six months ago. The difficulty was that no time has ever been indicated at which Dominion status should come into effect. The assumption has always been that this would have to be in the very near future, and such a plan presented difficulties from which anybody might shrink. But Dominion status need not necessarily come into effect immediately after the promise. There is a useful analogy in the bill which Senator Vandenberg has introduced in the United States Senate dealing with the Philippines, which suggests that independence be granted, to take effect at a fixed date ten years in the future, with a gradual transfer of functions to the natives in the meantime. There is no reason why the MacDonald government should not similarly promise Dominion status to India, to begin three or five years hence.

It is unlikely that such a proposal would meet with the opposition from the Tories which is created by a suggestion for immediate Dominion status, and especially in view of the present situation in India. It might be argued, of course, that Mr. MacDonald could not pledge future governments to such a course; and, in theory, this is true. But British governments are not in the habit of repudiating the solemn pledges of their predecessors; if they were, the business of the Empire would break down. The consequences of doing so would in this case be so serious that the possibility can almost be ruled out of discussion.

Would such a proposal be acceptable to the Indians? To some of them it certainly would not; nothing less than complete independence will now satisfy them. The situation in Ireland when the Free State was created is a good parallel for India. But Mr. Gandhi, and nearly all of the moderates,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would welcome a definite promise of Dominion status at a definite date, not too far away. The burden of odium would be shifted from the British, who bear it today, to the irreconcilable Indians. And even if the likelihood of success were much less than it is, the project would still be worth trying. For the only possible alternative is catastrophe.

The Radio and the Press

THE attitude toward the newspapers of Secretary Stimson and the other American delegates to the London conference is coming in for some drastic criticism. From several responsible sources it is charged that the Americans virtually abandoned the principle of open diplomacy, and that from first to last, they never dealt candidly with the journalists. The American newspapermen got their best information from the daily conferences of British statesmen with the press, or from the articles written by their European colleagues in the journals of London, Paris and Rome. It is charged that Secretary Stimson on several occasions called together a special group of American reporters representing papers which he regarded as "friendly," and gave them, not his complete confidence, but such material as would create "the right impression" when published at home. Naturally, the men who were left out keenly resented these informal salons, but those who were invited, and were thereby labeled as parts of a propaganda machine, were equally annoyed. On the other hand, Mr. Stimson objected to the presence at the conference of several representatives of American organizations devoted to the cause of armament reduction, in which he, also, was supposed to be interested, and he did everything he could to make things uncomfortable for them. No doubt the aloofness and secretiveness of the American delegates seems more important to the newspapermen than it will to the public at large; but anyone must concede that we had a right to expect that the Americans would at least be as faithful to the standards of open diplomacy as the Europeans.

A further point of importance is raised by Mr. Karl Bickel, president of the United Press Association, in a cablegram to Mr. Stimson. Mr. Bickel complains of the way in which the American delegation used the radio. A series of official and semi-official speeches was given by Mr. Stimson and others, broadcast to the United States and rebroadcast in this country from coast to coast. Technically, the experiment was a remarkable success; most of the speakers could be clearly heard, and there is no doubt that great numbers of persons listened to them. Mr. Bickel believes that such speeches are a very poor substitute for conferences with experienced and skeptical newspapermen who can ask a diplomat all sorts of embarrassing questions and record his replies. A speech can be, and in the nature of things is very likely to be, only veiled propaganda.

Speaking in general, radio broadcasting has not yet proved itself a formidable competitor of the press in the transmission of news. Its disadvantages in the day-to-day handling of routine information are too obvious to be dwelt upon. In the case of a great international conference like that in London, however, it has important potentialities. It can bring to millions of people, with a speed like that of thought itself, the vital developments from day to day. If the radio is used almost entirely for propaganda purposes, as it was during this conference, a great opportunity is lost. It is true that there was some broadcasting of addresses by newspaper men, but these were so general in character that they came more into the classification of the delegates' speeches than that of expert reporting of news.

What the radio needs today above all else is editors. Those who control broadcasting are, as a rule, men with no experience in public affairs or journalism, with little conception of the responsibility to the public which is undertaken by anyone who controls a vast medium for the dissemination of ideas. Most of them are, on the contrary, typical public-utility employees who fear to permit anything "controversial" to go on the air, when in fact controversy ought to be the lifeblood of radio. Even if the broadcasters themselves have something of the attitude of journalists, they are hampered by the conservatism of their employers. There has been some improvement in the past year or two, but there is room for very much more. Mr. Bickel's criticism should not be answered by abolishing the use of radio in future conferences like that at London. It should be met by having the radio send its own expert reporters, who should not only give their own daily interpretations of events, but, whenever possible, interview the statesmen before the microphone. Only when that is done will "the radio newspaper" be worthy of the attention of serious-minded people.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1930, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY
R. M. LOVETT GEORGE SOULE EDMUND WILSON
STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The World's Future Population

THE PRESENT population of the world numbers about 1,800 millions. It is very unevenly distributed over the earth. On the average, about thirty-four persons occupy each square mile of the planet. In the United States the rate is about forty, in England it approximates 700, in the Commonwealth of Australia it is only two. If the whole earth were as densely settled as England, there would be thirty-seven billion inhabitants, or twenty times the present population. Such a crowding of people all over the world is, of course, out of the question. It may, however, seem on first sight as if the earth's population capacity might easily be ten times its present population. But such a conclusion would be entirely wrong. The earth can under no circumstances carry something like eighteen billion people. How much, then, can it actually sustain?

The earth's population capacity is first limited by the potential agricultural resources. The surface of the earth is equal to thirty-three or thirty-four billion acres. How much of this is arable? Sir George Knibbs makes an allowance of one-half "for rocky, for mountainous, desert and cold regions, for woods and forests, for roads and railways, for factory and residence purposes." Professor East believes that 60 percent should be deducted for non-tillable soil. The arable land would, then, amount to thirteen or seventeen billion acres. How many acres does it take to support an individual? East believes two and a half acres to be the minimum for the earth as a whole, and he bases this belief on the assumption that in pre-war times Germany "cultivated about two acres for each man supported by her own agriculture, France two and three-tenths acres, Italy two and four-tenths acres and Belgium one and seven-tenths acres." But this assumption is erroneous. Germany, for instance, with a population of sixty-five millions, cultivated about eighty million acres. She was certainly not self-supporting. But the nutritive value of the food she imported both for men and animals amounted to 10 percent only of the total consumption. She, therefore, really cultivated one and four-tenths acres only for each person supported by her own agriculture, and not two acres. East, by putting the tillable soil of the earth at thirteen billion acres as a maximum, and the average requirements for each person at at least two and a half acres, reaches the conclusion that the earth can support not more than five billion inhabitants. If, on the other hand, one assumes that there are fifteen billion acres of arable land and that one and a half acres on an average are sufficient to support an individual, the maximum population would not have to be placed at less than ten billions. In submitting this alternative computation, I do not venture to say that the earth actually might comfortably carry ten billion people. The object of my computation was merely to show: (1) that East is wrong in assuming "that the world can sustain only 5,000 million people, unless unforeseen radical discoveries in science bring about revolutionary changes in our economic system"; (2) that every estimate which would put the population capacity of our agricultural resources at considerably more than ten billions would be unsound.

It may perhaps be objected that our food resources are not limited to our agricultural resources, that sea products may be drawn upon in the future on an unexpected scale, that synthetic food production might offer practically unlimited possibilities, and so on. All this may be true. But how about our mineral resources and our resources of power? The forecasts of some of the world's best experts in this matter are certainly far from encouraging. Even allowing for all conceivable advances in science and technique, and assuming that all human effort be directed to the maintenance of a maximum number of people, it seems impossible that the earth could sustain more than six times its present population, or about eleven billion people. And to attain this maximum would involve, as Knibbs rightly puts it, "a perfecting of human knowledge, of human organization and of human character, which transcends all our ordinary conceptions of real possibilities."

The earth's population capacity is indeed limited not only by our physical and our intellectual resources; it is limited also, and even much more, by peculiarities of the human character which find their expression in what we may briefly call national egoisms. The maximum population of, say ten or eleven billions can, of course, be attained only with the freest possible immigration. The United States, as all other countries, would have to open her gates to all nations of the world; she would have to accept her due share of the ten or eleven billions, say eight hundred millions. She would have to forget everything about the national-origins clause; she would have to welcome a hundred million or more foreign immigrants without the slightest discrimination on account of color, race or standard of living. If on the other hand, the people of the United States and of some other countries which are comparatively underpopulated, go on restricting immigration as they do, it is hard to see how the earth—even allowing for every conceivable advance in science and technique—could possibly double its present population.

But is such a doubling of the world's present pop-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ulation to be expected in the near future? The question is generally answered on the basis of the present rate of increase. The American sociologist Ross believes that the world's population is annually increasing by 1.44 percent, "a rate which would double mankind in a half-century." The English sociologist Carr-Saunders says that the present rate of increase is about 1.16 percent, which corresponds to a doubling in sixty years. The Australian statistician Knibbs assumes the yearly rate of increase to be one percent and finds thus a doubling in seventy years. Those three authorities, it seems to me, grossly overestimate the present rate of increase. According to the most recent estimates of the International Statistical Institute, the population of the world increased, during the years from 1920 to 1926, by an annual average of 11,400,000, or five-eighths of one percent—which rate, if it were to persist, would mean a doubling of the world's population in 110 years.

Big as these differences in the estimate of the present rate of increase may seem, they are, nevertheless, not of vital importance. A continuous increase of even only five-eighths of one percent a year would mean that the earth, which has been inhabited by human beings for hundreds of thousands of years, would reach its limits of population capacity in about three hundred years, even if human knowledge, human organization and human character were in the meantime perfected to a degree "which transcends all our ordinary conceptions of real possibilities." And if human character is to remain about what it is, the limit would already be approached in about one hundred years.

We thus reach the following conclusion: The world's population cannot, for a very long time, grow at the same rate as it seems to have grown from 1920 to 1926. If the increase does not slow down, the inhabitants of the overcrowded countries in the near future will have to claim the right of occupation of the less densely settled territories, and if the people of those territories resist and try to maintain their policy of restricted immigration, war becomes unavoidable. In case the nations with a relative surplus of territory should win the war, the defeated nations, if their growth is not checked otherwise, are doomed to starve. In case the nations living in densely populated areas should be victorious, they would force the defeated nations to grant them unhampered immigration and the world's population might continue to increase. But even with the freest possible migration, the limit of the earth's population capacity would be reached within a few centuries.

The terrible danger of a general overpopulation of the earth seems thus inescapable, if the population should continue for only a comparatively short time to increase as it has done in the recent past. But must we assume that this will actually occur? Are fertility and mortality actually such that if they continue to be what they are, the population of the earth will double about every 110 years? You may expect that a man who ventures to write on the world's future population will be able to answer such a simple question. And I would indeed answer it readily if I knew the age constitution of the world's population, the number of its births and the number of its deaths by age. But we statisticians know very little indeed of all that. We do not even approximately know the present population of the earth. I began by telling you that it numbers about 1,800,000,000. But this total is based in part on mere guesses. All we can say is that it is very likely not below 1,700,000,000, and not above 1,950,000,000.

Our ignorance of the number of births is still more appalling. Many countries, large and small, have no registration system whatsoever, and in many countries where registration exists, it is utterly inadequate. Take as an example South America, where conditions on the whole are much more satisfactory than in Asia or Africa. Bolivia has no birth registration at all. Brazil has practically no birth registration in the northern and central states. Colombia has birth registration throughout the country, but the results are wholly inacceptable, the birth rate, for instance, of the state of Magdalena fluctuating from 1915 to 1926 between seven and fifty-six per 1,000. Conditions are not much better in Ecuador, Venezuela and elsewhere. The total yearly number of births in South America may be 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 or 4,000,000. For China a guess of nine millions would be quite as justified as a guess of eighteen millions. Professor Ross tells us that 150,000 children are born daily into the world. But why 150,000? Why not 130,000, or rather 200,000, as Professor East assumes? Our actual knowledge of the facts merely allows us to say that the yearly number of births is very likely not lower than 45,000,000 and not higher than 75,000,000, and that the yearly number of deaths is very likely not lower than 35,000,000 and not higher than 60,000,000.

Readers will perhaps object that they do not worry particularly about the actual numbers of births and deaths, and that all they are interested in is the excess of births over deaths, which, as I stated, seems to be about five-eighths of one percent, or 11,400,000 a year. They will be interested in the actual numbers, if at all, only in so far as they would like to see this excess of births over deaths of 11,400,000 brought about by as small a number of births and deaths as possible. They would probably consider it a terrible waste of human energy if it were the result of, say, 64,400,000 births and 53,000,000 deaths, and would very much prefer to let it be the result of, say, 24,400,000 births and 13,000,000 deaths. But, incredible as it may sound, with 24,400,000 births a year fertility would have reached so low a level that mankind would die out before long, no matter how low mortality were reduced.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A very simple computation will demonstrate the truth of this apparently amazing statement. Let us suppose the total present number of women from fifteen to fifty years to be 450,000,000, and let us suppose that they bear each year 24,400,000 children, say, 12,400,000 boys and 12,000,000 girls. Let us suppose that none of those girls dies before having passed through the child-bearing age—that is, before having reached fifty years. We should then, in fifty years from now, have 12,000,000 females of fifteen years, 12,000,000 of sixteen years, and so on, or altogether 420,000,000 from fifteen to fifty years. Thus, even if none of the girls dies, the number of women of child-bearing age would be reduced within fifty years from 450,000,000 to 420,000,000, or in the proportion of one hundred to ninety-three. If the fertility rate of the 420,000,000 is then the same as that of the 450,000,000 of fifty years before, they would not bear more than 11,200,000, instead of 12,000,000, girls, and after another fifty years the women of child-bearing age would number only 392,000,000. These 392,000,000 would bear 10,450,000 girls only, and so on. It is evident that even with no mortality whatsoever, the number of women of child-bearing age would consistently decrease, and so would the number of births, if fertility remained the same.

How is it to be explained that in the fictitious case which we have just considered, the population was dying out in spite of the fact that the excess of births over deaths, as at present, constituted five-eighths of one percent of the population? The reason is that fertility was so low that the women of child-bearing age did not reproduce themselves: each hundred mothers gave birth to only ninety-three future mothers.

We have seen that the world's population apparently increases by about five-eighths of one percent per year. We know that if that rate of increase were to persist, the population would double within 110 years. But we now also know that the present rate of increase does not at all indicate what will be the future rate of increase if fertility and mortality remain what they actually are. We have indeed seen in a fictitious case that a population with a present rate of increase of five-eighths of one percent may in the future decrease by 7 percent in each generation, even if fertility and mortality remain what they are.

The question then arises: Has this fictitious case any practical bearing on the problem in which we are interested? My answer is that it has—for the very simple reason that this fictitious case represents the actual conditions in a very important part of the world. The Institute of Economics of the Brookings Institution in Washington has recently published a volume on "The Balance of Births and Deaths in Western and Northern Europe." It covers Great Britain and Ireland, France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland. This area, in 1926, had a population of 188,000,000—that is, 10 or 11 percent of the world's population—and had an excess of births over deaths amounting to five-eighths of one percent—that is, exactly the same rate as we found for the world as a whole. Yet, notwithstanding the fact that there occurred 3,613,000 births as against 2,449,000 deaths, fertility was already so low that the population no longer reproduced itself, but had a virtual deficit of about 7 percent. As the book says:

> According to the fertility and mortality in Western and Northern Europe in 1926, one hundred mothers gave birth to ninety-three future mothers only. With the fertility of 1926, the population is bound to die out unless mortality of potential mothers decreases beyond reasonable expectations. And fertility continued its downward path in 1927.

Why is it then that the population of Western and Northern Europe is still increasing? The reason is easy to understand. In the present population of those countries, the proportion of women of child-bearing age is particularly large, and the proportion of young children and old persons particularly low. The number of old persons is comparatively low because the generation born in the fifties and sixties of the last century was considerably reduced by a high infant mortality and by emigration. The number of young children is comparatively low because the number of births has considerably declined. It goes without saying that a large proportion of women of child-bearing age tends to swell the number of births, and that a small proportion of young children and of old persons tends to lower the number of deaths. But it is also evident that the persons between fifteen and fifty years who now are so numerous will grow older and will thereby swell those age groups where death claims most victims, while there are not sufficient children to fill up the age groups which are more or less secure against death and which contribute most to the reproduction of the population. With fertility and mortality as they have prevailed for some time, the rate of increase is bound to decline and to give way before long to an actual decrease.

Are similar conditions to be found in other parts of the world? Does the rate of increase elsewhere convey as unique a picture of the rate of reproduction as in Western and Northern Europe? The Institute of Economics is now extending its studies on the balance of births and deaths to other parts of the world, and I hesitate to venture an opinion on the results of those studies before they are completed. But a few remarks may not be out of place. Dublin and Lotka, some years ago, found that while the rate of natural increase of the white population of the United States, in 1920, was 1.1 percent, one-half of the increase was due to the age constitution which tends to swell the number of births and to lower the number of deaths. In the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meantime mortality has decreased, but fertility has decreased much more, so that the genuine rate of increase is certainly lower than it was in 1920. Even without having accurate data at our disposal for all the countries involved, we may then at least say this much—that the population of Western and Northern Europe, North America and Australia combined, no longer reproduces itself. These countries, however, were responsible for about one-fourth of the world's population increase from 1920 to 1926. If their population in the future remains stable instead of increasing, and if in all other countries the population increases at the rate which apparently prevailed from 1920 to 1926, mankind will double in 150 instead of 110 years.

But are there not perhaps countries where the age constitution of the population is such that the present rate of increase lags behind their actual reproduction rate? Such a state of affairs, of course, is perfectly conceivable. Let us assume a nation which for many years has had a stable birth rate and a stable death rate, both being rather low; such a nation very likely would have a larger proportion of old people than other nations with a rapidly increasing population. Let us further assume that mass emigration, epidemics or war had wiped out the majority of the people in the reproductive age groups. For some time to come, the rate of increase would then necessarily be very slight, since the birth rate would decrease while the death rate (on account of the preponderance of old people) might increase. But when the old generation dies, it will not be fully replaced by the now decimated reproductive age groups, while there will be sufficient children to fill the gaps in the reproductive age groups. If, then, fertility and mortality remain what they are, the birth rate will again increase and the death rate decrease. A nation with an age constitution which tends to swell the number of deaths and to lower the number of births is therefore quite conceivable. But I do not know of any such nation. There are countries where some of the necessary conditions are fulfilled. Russia, for instance, has an enormous proportion of young children and her reproductive age groups have been decimated by war and starvation, so that one might assume that her age constitution tends to swell the number of deaths, but she has so few old people—only as many over forty-five as under five—that her death rate after all is smaller than corresponds to her true mortality.

We thus reach the following conclusion: If fertility and mortality remain what they are, it will take mankind more, and possibly much more, than 150 years to double its numbers. In the meantime, the race composition of the world, and especially of Europe, would have considerably changed, since the Anglo-Saxons, Germans, Scandinavians and French no longer reproduce themselves, while the Slavs still have an enormous genuine growth. As a consequence thereof, the proportion of Slavs would greatly increase. This by itself would not mean something unheard of. For a long time the Slavic population of Europe has increased much more than the Teutonic, and the Teutonic much more than the Romance. It has indeed been estimated that, in the course of the nineteenth century, the Romance element decreased from three-eighths to one-fourth, while the Slav element rose from one-fourth to three-eighths and the Teutonic element all the time comprised three-eighths. It would be rather irrelevant if in the future the proportion of Slavs in Europe increased not only at the cost of the Romance but also at the cost of the Teutonic race; it would be rather irrelevant—as long as the Romance and the Teutonic races maintained their own. But once the countries which they inhabit become dependent on immigration in order to keep up population, the Slavs will flock in. They will come because they will find opportunities to work at fair wages, and they will be welcome because—notwithstanding all the eloquently praised blessings of depopulation—no nation wants deserted farms, closed factories, vacant houses, fewer taxpayers. What will be the outcome of such mass immigration, whether and where the Slavs would be assimilated, or, on the contrary, become the dominant race, is impossible to predict, just as it is impossible to predict whether the people who would occupy the vacant places in North America and Australia would be white or colored.

We have thus far assumed that fertility and mortality will remain what they are. But fertility and mortality may change, as they have changed in former times. How will this affect the future population of the world? In order to answer this question, one should know what fertility and mortality will actually be, and this, of course, no one knows. But it is possible, at least for Western and Northern Europe, America and Australia, to form some idea of the possibilities involved. Mortality in all likelihood will not increase, it will rather decline. But the future reduction of mortality in those ages which are the only decisive ones for reproduction, namely, the ages under fifty years, cannot be very great after all that has already been accomplished. Half a century ago, 30 or 40 percent of the newly born girls were cut off from motherhood by premature death, while today those victims number 15 percent only. The margin left for improvement is therefore very scant. Even a reduction from 15 to 10 percent, welcome as it would be, could not essentially affect the trend of population. As to fertility, the range of possibilities is certainly much larger. Fertility might increase again, and there are people who predict that such an increase will occur with increasing prosperity. But so far an increase of prosperity has not resulted, as a rule, in an increase of fertility. There are, on the other hand, people who predict that fertility will further decrease. A recent article on the birth-control movement says:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> At the present time it is gathering force throughout the world, and there seems little doubt that the next few decades will see its practically universal acceptance in Europe and America and their dominions, and its considerable advance in the East.

A great deal will depend, indeed, upon whether a considerable advance of the birth-control movement in the East will accompany its practically universal acceptance in Europe and North America. If by any chance the movement in the East should be delayed, the Mongolian race might find birth restriction not particularly urgent, because there would be outside of its own countries vacant territories in which to settle.

As matters stand, there is no real danger of a general overpopulation. Mankind will probably increase much slower than most people nowadays believe. The Anglo-Saxons, the Germans, the Scandinavians and the French will very likely retrogress in the course of this century, and since the Slavs and some other races will continue to grow, the proportion of the Teutonic and the French races will diminish even much quicker than their absolute numbers. It is hard to see how this process might effectively be stopped. But it will be accelerated if the birth-restriction movement should continue to be most successful among those nations which have already ceased to reproduce themselves.

ROBERT R. KUCZYNSKI.

Can They Smoke Like Gentlemen?

WHEN President Nielson of Smith College announced to his students the new rule restricting smoking to two fireproof rooms, following a number of dormitory fires due to cigarettes in waste baskets or matches flung at muslin curtains, he closed his necessary but bound-to-be-unpopular address with this amiable comment, "The trouble is, my dear young ladies, you do not smoke like gentlemen."

Apparently a good many women still feel that their right to smoke is a bit precarious, if one may so conclude from the bravado which accompanies the smoking habit, now that it is becoming the custom among groups not given to much philosophizing in regard to what constitutes suitable behavior. The right of women to smoke in restaurants and other public places has been recognized for some years, and yet there are still those who feel that they must pull forth cigarettes and puff at them determinedly from the moment of entrance to the moment of leaving a public dining-room, smoking right through soup, fish, meat, salad and dessert in a way to horrify the epicure and astonish the masculine contingent which enjoys its food. Charming, long-legged stenographers perched on stools before candy-shop soda fountains, smoking a cigarette from one hand and sipping chocolate ice-cream soda with marshmallow frosting from the other, are a sight now becoming common, but one calculated to paralyze the less hardy section of the human race. Children buying lollipops and old ladies purchasing sweets for Sunday-school festivals pause on the threshold, confused between the beribboned, belaced daintiness of the decorations and the barroom atmosphere contributed by the customers. Sometimes one of the old ladies can be heard to murmur, "Gentlemen never did such things."

Who in America remembers seeing a man smoke in a railway dining car? The railroad has thoughtfully provided another place for smoking all these years, and the male traveler has recognized the rights of the old, the young and the ill of the traveling public, to eat in the closely confined space of a dining car without the addition of tobacco smoke; but not so those girls who feel it necessary to proclaim their emancipation from any vantage point. The embarrassed stewards of dining cars, explaining to male patrons why they cannot smoke while the lady at the other end puffs her cigarette, have furnished one of the inexpensive amusements of American life to a constant traveler. The waiting-rooms of country railroad stations, usually plastered with No Smoking signs and sometimes with requests to loaf in the baggage room, where the male of the species has always been found taking his smoke, seem to be another favorite stamping ground for the small-town or even city-bred woman smoker. Although I have haunted art exhibitions and art galleries for years, I have, I think, never seen any man smoking in those chaste and neutral backgrounds. It remained for a couple of rather plain middle-aged women to muss up the floor and haze up the air, successfully obscuring the exquisite colors of Georgia O'Keefe at a recent showing.

Knowing that any social group is apt to be a bit crude and uncontrolled when taking on new and expanded customs, recognizing the validity of the inferiority complex from which bravado springs when women try to act like gentlemen without being such, and believing that in time the solid human virtue of consideration for the rights of others would prevail, I should have held my peace, had not this unfortunate habit of smoking in unsuitable places and under unsuitable circumstances recently pervaded the shops and department stores of most of our large and small cities in the East. First it was the little millinery shops in smart side streets which began putting ash trays on the table in front of the mirror. Then came the "booteries," which offered grandma matches on a wonderfully bal-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anced ash receiver when she came in to buy a pair of felt bedroom slippers. These were merely funny; but recently the ladies have taken to smoking all over our department stores and larger mercantile establishments in such a way as to create a serious fire hazard, and I feel that people should know the danger, lest what are now merely bad manners should become a serious menace to life.

In practically every store of any size there exists a serious fire hazard—first, because of the quickly inflammable nature of the goods and wares displayed for sale, and second, because of the presence in the building of large numbers of strangers, unorganized, undisciplined and uninstructed with reference to the location of exits, even when these are adequate. The fire hazard is well known to fire departments, labor departments, fire underwriters and other expert bodies. The technical difficulty of providing enough stairways to empty such buildings of the huge crowds which sometimes congregate at bargain sales and holiday shopping periods is so great as to make it impossible to predict what would happen in case of a fire in a mercantile establishment at a crowded time of day. It is impossible to have fire drills, as in factories, and very difficult to provide sufficient exit facilities.

The codes and laws governing mercantile establishments have never included a prohibition of smoking, as do the factory laws, because in the past smoking was never the custom there. The main reliance for safety in these establishments has always been upon the prevention of fire. The most common cause of fire of all classes in the United States is cigarettes. Our carelessness with them is proverbial and, now that women are smoking, the big mercantile establishments which have heretofore been free of great disasters in this country are subject to a new hazard.

In the state of New York there is a building code which provides for good exit facilities in all mercantile structures erected since 1924, but the fact remains that most of the larger mercantile buildings in that state and throughout the country have too few exits to take care of the crowds. Many of them are without the protection of automatic sprinklers. Even with the sprinkler protection and with perfect exits, the cigarette affords a very great chance of disaster in such buildings, for the very materials which are on sale create what is called a flash fire from the tiniest spark; and before there is time for the sprinklers to operate or for people to reach the exits, panic and trampling may produce one of those disasters which have so often been the cause of loss of life in America. In Brooklyn, not long ago, when the stairways of the two top floors of a department store were burned out two minutes after the discovery of smoke, a serious department-store tragedy was averted only by the cool-headedness of the elevator operator, who kept running his car up and down until the people congregated in front of his fireproof elevator shaft were removed to safety. This was a small establishment; the hazard is multiplied many times in the larger stores.

This hazard should be stamped out now before the custom of smoking in department stores has become common. Men have never permitted themselves any such careless infringement upon the rights of others. Walk into any haberdashery or men's clothing shop and you will not see men smoking; nor do you see them smoking in hardware stores, florist shops or other places they patronize. They find it possible to try on their shoes and their hats and even to go into fitting-rooms and have their new evening clothes fitted, without smoking; but not so the women. Only a determined effort on the part of store managers, fire underwriters and local fire departments, together with the rigid practice of a rule of social etiquette, based on consideration for the lives and comfort of others and sponsored by women who have achieved both emancipation and social position, will check this growing danger.

Department-store managers often are too ready to jump to a conclusion as to what "women want." Thus, in the case of smoking, they have practically invited the custom to establish itself in their midst. In some cities today it is next to impossible to purchase a chiffon evening frock or a bit of lingerie except from the depths of a soft chair upholstered in green glazed chintz, where the customer is surrounded by ash trays and glowing cigarettes provided by a thoughtless management. But the lady whom I saw leaning on one elbow at a lace counter the other day, puffing a cigarette while purchasing yards of tulle frills, was a symbol of what the unchastened woman can do when she has not been taught to smoke like a gentleman.

FRANCES PERKINS.

Time Is a Flower on the Sea.

In that little space between
Our kisses I have heard the sound
Of something we have never seen,
Nor shall, save underground.

And in those moments I have heard
The tread of Time, whose fierce unrest
Will crush the singing of that bird
That builds within the breast.

O piteous heart, be deaf, be blind!
Against the coming of that season
What avails the curious mind,
Or the stalwart reason?

Then naught's to do but kiss and say
That Time's a flower on the sea,
That Death is but that hour each day
When we must separate be.

HAROLD LEWIS COOK.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Religion and the Soviets

EXPERIENCE teaches the observant student of mankind to regard atrocities as a preface to political folly. The smell of blood affects us as it affects a herd of cattle; we are ready for a blind rush. In England a hot campaign against Russia is being engineered, with more than the usual apparatus of horrors, and echoes of it reach us from every corner of the world. Here its purpose is manifestly to discredit the Labor government, and to drive it to break off the diplomatic relations which it has resumed. That, if it could be compassed, would be a triumph; for if even the Labor party should have to admit that friendly dealings with the Revolution are impossible, the break would be permanent and the way would be clear to a policy, first of boycott and then of covert or open attack.

The ground is well chosen. In the name of religion men will perform every good deed save one: they will not weigh evidence. We are confronted, therefore, with the statement that religion in Russia is today under the harrow of a ruthless and bloody persecution which has suddenly grown more cruel in recent months. To support this myth, even The Morning Post, a paper which used to have a tradition of honesty, printed, on the authority of a Russian bishop, a long chronicle of abominations which might have been a page torn from Fox's "Book of Martyrs." Bishops had been broken on the wheel, scalped, compelled to swallow molten lead, and with them innocent monks and nuns had been slaughtered by the thousand. This ghastly invention had circulated for a month before the bishop was compelled to admit that in only two cases could he mention a place and a widely approximate date, that his only authority was hearsay, and that in any event these deviltries happened, if at all, between 1917 and 1920. A dignitary of the English Church then produced, based on a quotation from "Pravda," a narrative of the bloody suppression of a supposedly harmless little sect called the "Name-glorifiers." It looked like an authentic case of persecution, until it was discovered that the reverent agitator had suppressed the essential passages of a very interesting narrative. The leaders of this "sect" were all of them ex-officers of Denikin's army, and their "monastery" was an arsenal of bombs and rifles.

May the present witness, who has been twice in Russia since the Revolution, give his own testimony, bluntly and frankly? One does not begin to get at the truth until one dismisses the whole of this mythology. The tortures are inventions. Murders did occur during the furious civil war, but if priests were sometimes executed, like many leaders on both sides, it was because they openly worked for the Whites, and not because they were Christians. It is certainly the policy of the Communists to discourage religion. They have disendowed and disestablished the Orthodox Church. They regard tolerance, as they do democracy in the Western sense, as part of the tradition of middle-class liberalism, which they reject. They are doing what no state has ever done since the French Revolution: they openly encourage free thought. Towards the priesthood their attitude (as that of the French Republic often was, before the War) is one of unconcealed suspicion and contempt.

All this is true, and yet it is a mistake to talk of "persecution." Belief is not an offense for which any man has ever suffered punishment. There is no attempt to suppress the Church, nothing, indeed, that could compare with the much more ruthless struggle in Mexico. All the observances of the Church go on, freely and unmolested, and I, who happen to enjoy its music, can testify that I have visited many of its services, and found them well attended. Education is severely secular, but the law guarantees freedom for the performance of all the rites of the many religions of Russia. To this summary of the essential facts one must add that the official atmosphere is without question unfriendly to religion; that the Church suffers, as does every organized body of opinion, save Communism, from the suppression of the free printing press, and that its leaders must do their work under the eyes of a vigilant police, which is prompt to cast them into prison if they do anything which can be called "counter-revolutionary."

To understand these novel conditions one must see this conflict between a godless party and an old-world church in the light of history. It is a phase in the social struggle, or, as a Russian would say, in the "class-war." If the Communists discourage religion, it is not simply because they regard it as an antiquated form of metaphysics. Its offense in their eyes is not the falsity of its teaching. They became involved in a struggle with the Orthodox Church for the much simpler reason that it was a prop of Tsardom, second only in importance to the police. When the autocracy fell, it took its stand in the civil war with the defenders of the landed and employing class. Even today, in the bitter struggle between coöperative and individualist farming which divides the villages, the priest is usually the ally of the "kulaks," that is to say, of the moneyed peasants, who resist the Soviet's plans for collective agriculture.

To understand these conditions, the Protestant reader must dismiss every analogy based on Western conditions. It happens that I have seen this Eastern Church at close quarters in Greece and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Turkey, as well as in Russia. Its clergy inspire no respect, whether by their learning or their lives. Its teaching has no bearing whatever upon conduct. At its best, its few sincere saints were ascetics who had turned their back on humanity. Its average priest is a customs officer, who takes toll of the traveler on the frontier between this world and the next. The Orthodox bishop can be a violent politician, though one would hardly call him a militant Christian. I have known in Turkey more than one who employed a hired gang of armed cutthroats—indeed, one of these episcopal gangs once lay in wait to shoot me. This church was at open enmity with every progressive element in Russia, not with the Socialists only, but with the whole liberal intelligentsia.

There were even simpler reasons why the Communists were compelled to struggle against this reactionary church. It is often said that Russians are fatalists. Was it nature and the wide steppe that made them so? Assuredly this church had her part in sapping their energies and chaining their wills. In the early years of the Revolution, the Communist agitators went hopefully into the villages, and tried to teach the peasants that the one way to defeat drought is to plough deep. They were met by this "fatalism": "Rain is God's gift; it is impious to try to circumvent His will. If He sends rain, the crops will grow; if not, it is a sign that we must suffer for our sins. There is, in emergencies, only one hopeful course—the bishop must pray for rain." All this was not a quaint survival, but a living and tyrannous belief, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that in every typical village, every advance in the technique and organization of agriculture has been made against the fierce resistance of priests, whose anger could doom these simple peasants to hell-fire.

What could a progressive party do? In order to get bread for the towns, it has first to sow doubt in the peasants' minds. So it challenged and exposed the contemporary miracles of the Church. It scattered atheist books among those whom it was feverishly teaching to read. It promoted scientific lectures and debates. I saw, for example, in a little country town, a thronged debate, conducted with perfect fairness, between a priest and an atheist lecturer. For my own part, at the risk of shocking the reader, I feel compelled to say that this intellectual warfare against the Church was necessary and salutary, and I applaud the Bolsheviki for conducting it with courage. I could wish that they had refrained from ridicule and parody, but much of this rationalist campaign was, as I can testify, after looking through their popular scientific books, genuinely educational. The daily press and the radio followed on the same lines.

How, in this temper of frank opposition, did this rationalist party regulate the legal relations of the churches with the State? The groundwork of its legislation is not as illiberal as one might expect. Any group of twenty persons may constitute itself legally, and register as a congregation, and is entitled to the use of a church, rent free. There are even provisions for smaller groups. The free exercise of the rite, including preaching, if confined to religious themes, is guaranteed. It is more often at the top, in dealing with the central organizations, than at the bottom, in the life of the local church, that the police is apt to interfere, with some more or less well founded charge of counter-revolutionary activity. But a church must be nothing but a church. Charitable and social activities are strictly forbidden: the State cares for the sick, the aged and the poor. If the church has a library, it must contain only devotional books. The law has an ominous clause permitting local authorities to take over redundant churches for social purposes.

I doubt, however, whether that clause has been gravely abused. Churches are as numerous in a Russian city, even in a big village, as saloons are in England. During twelve years, some 3,350 Orthodox churches have been closed, according to the official figures: about 46,500 remain open. In some instances, of which I saw one, beautiful old church buildings have been rescued from neglect and vandalism and restored as museums of art. I believe, though I cannot give the figures, that the Protestant and nonconformist churches have increased in numbers. On the other hand, the law classes the clergy with profiteers, rentiers, usurers and the old Tsarist police as unproductive citizens, and deprives them of the right to vote. That may not be an inestimable privilege in itself, but its loss entails some inconveniences, for productive citizens have the first claim when house-room is rationed.

The most questionable feature of Soviet legislation about religion is that which regulates education. The schools of the State (and there are no others) are secular. But the religious teaching of the young, in groups or schools, is strictly forbidden, up to the age of eighteen. At the risk of horrifying my readers, I will confess that in principle this provision seems to me sound. It is an outrage on the immature mind of a child that any grown person should use his ascendancy to impose his dogmas upon it. Let it grow to ripeness and then choose for itself. One may say this with conviction, but can one expect a sincere Catholic priest or a Baptist pastor to observe such a prohibition? In point of fact it is not absolute. Parents may teach what they please, and the priest, as he goes from house to house, may catechise the children, while there is no restriction on their attendance at worship. It is, perhaps, the stricter Jews who suffer most severely, for their usage demands many years of the most elaborate study in a Talmudic school. Such schools do, in fact, exist "underground," but when they are unearthed the penalty for their conductors is prison. It is, however, untrue that any rabbi has been executed. It would be easier to justify this law of religious neutrality for children, if the Communists themselves observed it. But youths much under eighteen are organized by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the party as "pioneers," and they become militant atheists: they, however, come chiefly from Communist families. There is in some schools an anti-religious atmosphere, though the general belief that atheism and communism are effectively taught is an exaggeration.

These are the facts as I saw them; I have tried to report them honestly. The struggle is inevitable, and little as one may like the crude Russian brand of materialism, it is doing a necessary work of emancipation. Religion is rather handicapped than persecuted. With a free newspaper press at their command, it is probable that the "schismatic" sects would have become a considerable power; in fact, they have grown. One's dislike of the restrictions which weigh on the clergy is simply a part of the general liberal case against any monopoly over the organization of opinion. One cannot approve; but neither is it wise to protest. Remonstrances from capitalistic countries will be disregarded, for the simple reason that Russians view the struggle between the Church and the unbelievers as a phase in the class-conflict. Nor need one take these restrictions on liberty too tragically. Freedom this people has never known; in the mass it neither demands nor understands it. The nonconformists are freer than they were under Tsardom: the Jews are liberated from the savage and degrading oppression of the priest, and if the Orthodox Church declines, was it not bound to crumble under the ruins of the throne?

London. H. N. BRAILSFORD.

Hard Times for Farmers

II: *What Can the Tariff Do?*

This is the second of a series of six articles in which different authors discuss one of America's most pressing domestic problems, that of the long continued depression in agriculture. In the first article, published last week, Mr. E. G. Nourse described the difficulties now facing the Federal Farm Board. The third article, by H. H. McIntyre, will tell how the wheat farmers of the Canadian West have vigorously attacked the problem of coöperative marketing.—THE EDITORS.

EARLY last year, there appeared in The New Republic an article[1] in which Mr. Robert Stewart discussed the possibility of agricultural relief through tariff legislation. "The farmer," he concluded, "will receive little real help from tariff legislation proposed by Congress." Some persons have criticized this conclusion for being based on insufficient evidence. Mr. Stewart, they say, took only commodities that were particularly favorable to his case—though they, to be sure, provide 44 percent of the farmers' cash income—wheat, cotton, corn, hogs, tobacco and rice.

The present article will discuss four commodities —dairy products, eggs, wool and flax—which are cited by tariff advocates as the best examples of effective protection. Together these commodities provide 21 percent of the farmers' cash income. Consequently, this article presents the best that can truthfully be said for agricultural tariffs. If, after this supplementary study, the indications are that farmers will not be materially aided by the tariff legislation about to be passed by Congress, there can be no excuse for saying that only one side of the argument has been presented.

[1] This article, "Can the Tariff Help the Farmer?," was printed in the issue of January 30, 1929.

Butter production in the United States amounts to over two billion pounds a year, with a total farm value of $800,000,000, or eight times as much as the cash income from rice, three times as much as that from tobacco, twice as much as that from corn, and as much as the cash income from wheat. The present tariff on butter is 12 cents per pound. Under this tariff, butter producers received approximately 5.7 cents per pound above the London or world-market price in 1929. Hence, the tariff of 12 cents was not then fully effective, but was nearly 50 percent so. The month when New York prices were the highest above London prices was March, with 10 cents; the lowest month was November, with 1.5 cents above London. The total annual benefit from the butter tariff amounted in 1929 to approximately $90,000,000. Since 80 percent of our farmers keep cows, this tariff benefit helps 4,988,000 farmers, in proportion to the number of cows they keep and the amount of their product marketed. Assuming this $90,000,000 to be divided equally among them, each producing farmer received an $18 benefit in 1929.

Under present conditions the 12-cent tariff is practically prohibitive, less than three million pounds (about 0.1 percent of the domestic production) being imported in 1929. During the same period nearly four million pounds of butter were exported, leaving an actual net export of one million pounds.

In 1928, dairymen received a benefit of about $125,000,000, as compared with the $90,000,000 benefit of 1929. This 28-percent decrease in 1929 was primarily due to our increased production, which depressed domestic prices. At the present time (March, 1930), domestic prices are actually below prices of Danish butter in London.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These data indicate that because of the present tendency to increase domestic production (creamery-butter production in 1922 was 1,153,515,000 pounds; in 1929, it was 1,513,580,300 pounds), the proposed tariff increase will be of no benefit to dairymen; and, furthermore, they indicate that farmers will experience even more than a 28-per-cent decline in tariff benefits in 1930.

The House bill increases the duty of 2.5 cents per gallon on milk to 5 cents per gallon, and increases the present duty of 20 cents per gallon on cream to 48 cents per gallon. These increased rates will practically prohibit milk and cream imports from Canada, since they offset the price differential which New York now holds above Montreal. The importation of cream from Canada into the Boston market amounted to 15 percent of the total Boston supply in 1926. Shutting out Canadian imports will result in a shifting of the source of 15 percent of Boston's cream supply from Canada to the Middle West. The price of cream will have to increase enough to compel Boston consumers to pay the freight rate of 14 cents per gallon from Chicago to Boston. New England dairymen will benefit directly by this increased price, and Mid-west farmers will benefit indirectly by probable better butter prices brought about through the removal of between three and four million gallons of cream, or the equivalent of between fourteen and sixteen million pounds of butter, from the butter market, to be used for sweet-cream consumption in the East. Thus, the proposed tariff legislation increasing the duties on milk and cream will undoubtedly prove beneficial to United States dairymen generally. (It is interesting to note that President Hoover raised the milk and cream duties the full 50 percent allowed by presidential proclamation on May 14, 1929, to be effective June 14, 1929. This makes the present duty on milk 3.75 cents per gallon and the cream duty 30 cents per gallon.)

The House bill makes all cheese dutiable at "7 cents per pound, not less than 37.5 percent ad valorem." This increases the duty on American and other cheeses except Swiss, since they now carry a duty of but 5 cents per pound, but not less than 25 percent ad valorem. The duty on the only kind of cheese on which an increase could materially help producers—namely, Swiss—was actually decreased, for Swiss cheese already carries a duty of "7.5 cents per pound, not less than 37.5 percent ad valorem." The increased duty on all cheese except Swiss will probably be useless to producers, because imports of American cheese, the only competitive type of which we produce appreciable amounts, are not now a price-determining factor. Had the duty on Swiss cheese been increased, it would have increased the price now received by domestic producers of Swiss cheese by about 70 percent of the amount of the increased duty. Since Wisconsin produces 90 percent of the Swiss cheese of the United States, the benefits would have gone primarily to this one state. As the bill now stands, cheese producers will receive practically no benefit from the proposed tariff legislation.

The United States produced 1,900,000,000 dozens of eggs in 1924, which had a farm value of approximately $547,000,000. Eggs provide about 3½ percent of the farmers' cash income and are produced in varying amounts by 90 percent of our farmers. The House bill increases the duty on eggs in the shell from 8 cents per dozen to 10 cents per dozen, and on "eggs, egg yolk and egg albumen frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved" from 6 cents per pound to 8 cents per pound. The bill does not change the duty on dried-egg products, the principal competing group. In 1929 imports of dried eggs, dried albumen, dried yolks and eggs imported in any other form, converted to their equivalent of eggs in the shell, totaled 49,000,000 dozen, plus the albumen from 17,500,000 dozen. Exports of eggs from the United States for 1929 totaled 12,000,000 dozen, leaving a net import of 37,000,000 dozen and the albumen equivalent of 17,500,000 more. At the present time, 180,000,000 dozen eggs are "broken out" annually in the United States, and either frozen or sold in liquid form. If the imports of dried, frozen and other eggs are prohibited, the domestic market for breaking will be increased by about 20 percent.

This withdrawal of approximately 37,000,000 dozen eggs yearly will supply a market for about 20 percent of our present production of "dirties," "cracks" and undersized eggs, which are not now broken because the Chinese egg products undersell us and take away our market. The removal of this number of poor-grade eggs might possibly cause an increase of as much as one or two cents per dozen in the price of our better-grade eggs. While the annual benefit on the total production would be an appreciable amount—$38,000,000—the average benefit to producers (except for a few large commercial poultrymen) would be very small, since poultry is kept by most farmers as a side line for getting pocket money with which to buy groceries. Assuming that the shutting out of imports would raise the price of all grades of eggs a full 2 cents per dozen, and that the benefits were distributed equally among the 5,505,617 farmers keeping chickens, the benefit per producing farmer would be approximately 70 cents annually. This item may be a factor in farm relief, but it is certainly a small factor indeed.

The United States produced an average of 139,000,000 pounds of scoured wool per year for the period 1923-1928. Wool provides about one percent of the farmers' cash income. The present duty of 31 cents per scoured pound gives the wool growers in Texas, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, California, Ohio and other states an annual average benefit of $43,000,000. There are 430,700 farm-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers, or 7 percent of all our farmers, keeping sheep. This benefit of $43,000,000 from the wool duty is not divided equally among them, but goes primarily to a few large ranchers. The House bill proposes to increase the rate to 34 cents per pound. Under this rate, the benefits will probably total about $47,000,000.

In general, the tariff on wool is three-fourths to fully effective, varying somewhat with different grades of wool. The proposed 3-cent increase provided in the House bill will benefit wool producers between 2 and 3 cents per pound. The chief criticisms of the wool duty are that only 7 percent of our farmers keep sheep, and that the benefits go principally to a few large ranchers.

The flax crop of the United States in 1927 was 26,583,000 bushels, having a farm value of $49,373,000, or 0.6 percent of the farmers' total cash income. Approximately 104,000 farmers produce flaxseed in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota and Montana, where on many farms wheat has been partly given up for this more profitable crop. The present duty of 40 cents per bushel on flaxseed yields producers an annual benefit of $5,600,000, or $53 per farm. The House bill increases the duty to 56 cents per bushel. Under this rate, the probable annual benefit will be $8,250,000, or $78 per producing farm. Better prices for flaxseed will induce some shifting among farmers of these four wheat states from wheat to flax, thereby decreasing to some extent the present United States wheat surplus. That this shifting will account for but a small amount of the total wheat surplus is obvious. The appearance of flax wilt when flaxseed follows flaxseed necessitates a crop rotation in which flaxseed crops on the same land are four or five years apart. This has a very positive control over actual and potential flaxseed acreage. Nevertheless, a tariff on flax is very beneficial to the 104,000 flax growers and, to a very limited extent, indirectly beneficial to wheat growers.

The facts here presented indicate that even in those cases where the tariff is considered to be most effective on agricultural products, increases now proposed by Congress will not materially influence the farm situation. Dairy interests will benefit by the increase in the cream and milk duties, but the benefit will be a small amount per producing farmer. The increase in the butter tariff will prove practically useless, as will also the proposed change in the cheese tariff. Poultrymen will benefit from the increased egg tariff, but the production of eggs for market is such a small side line on most farms that the benefits accruing to each producing farmer will be a small amount. The wool producers will probably benefit by between three-fourths and the full amount of the increase in the wool duty, but a few ranchers will get most of it. The increase in the flax duty will materially help flax growers, but they comprise but 1.6 percent of the American farmers.

The benefits here listed include the chief agricultural products on which the tariff is the most effective. Yet one cannot fail to be impressed with the smallness of these benefits, even though they comprise the main portion of all those derived from agricultural tariffs.

To any student of the tariff, it is obvious that, so far as solving the farm problem is concerned, the new tariff bill is a very minor factor. Without doubt, agriculture as a whole would have been better off had the tariff not been changed at all, because the increase in rates on manufactured and other non-agricultural products provided in the present bill will burden farmers as a whole more than the increases on agricultural products will benefit farmers as a whole. Agricultural groups should, therefore, exert their influence in securing legislation to aid in establishing and developing better marketing machinery, better tax policies and better credit facilities, which will, in the long run, produce a greater benefit and help a larger proportion of our farmers than will any possible tariff legislation.

ROLAND R. RENNE.

Washington Notes

THE OUTLOOK for the fall elections has been obscured by the din of the anti-administration elements in the Senate, which is out of proportion to their strength in the country, and also by the curiously inarticulate nature of Mr. Hoover's Senate support. Yet the elections, after all, are the only real test. Everything that has happened in Washington since Mr. Hoover took hold fourteen months ago is politically important only in so far as it can be translated into votes. If his misfortunes and mistakes, if the tariff mess, the Huston mess, the Parker nomination and the prohibition situation, have an adverse effect upon the voters in November, then they are important; if they do not, then they are trivial. I repeat that it is impossible to judge these things from the noise in the Senate. As a matter of fact, it is impossible to have any sound judgment before the votes are counted, and predictions are meaningless and futile. Nevertheless, a man may have an opinion; and my point is that the opinion is more worth while if based on facts obtained from practical people who know their state situations than if based on Democratic and Progressive speeches in the Senate or on the emanations of the ebullient Democratic propaganda bureau.

Some months ago I was convinced that there was no chance of a real political upset as a result of the congressional campaign. It seemed to me that, of course, there would be a considerable Democratic gain in House and Senate from the inevitable and normal recession of the Republican tide in the off year. But that the present House majority of 105 could be wiped out and that a Democratic Speaker—in the person of the redoubtable Garner, whose absence from the last Democratic convention which met in his state has never been fully explained—would succeed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the glittering and polished Longworth, did not seem to me to be in the cards. Now I am not so sure. Digging about a bit, one gets some surprising and interesting information. For example, one of the shrewdest Republican politicians there is, whose knowledge of Indiana is thorough and complete, regretfully tells me his party in that state stands an excellent chance of losing as many as six seats in the next House. There are now ten Republicans from Indiana and three Democrats. If what this man believes proves true, the delegation will have four Republicans and nine Democrats next time. It will be conceded that this would be much more than the normal off-year gain. It would, in fact, be an extraordinary upset. And if this is the situation in Indiana, where no particular or local reason exists to account for it, there is reason to believe that the same conditions prevail in the neighboring states of Ohio and Illinois. Quiet inquiry among politicians from these states tends to confirm this notion.

Then there is another significant piece of evidence—to wit, the withdrawal from the field, as candidate to succeed himself in the Senate, of that scintillating West Virginia statesman, the Hon. Guy Despard Goff. Mr. Goff explains his withdrawal as obedience to the advice of his physician, who tells him he is not well enough to make the campaign. My information is that the principal cause in the decline of his health is the almost certain prospect that he would be defeated by the Democratic Neeley, his former colleague, who has been industriously working for a return ticket ever since he was defeated, in much the same way that David Walsh of Massachusetts worked after his defeat by the late Mr. Lodge. Neither will relish the comparison, but there are other points of resemblance between Neeley and Walsh. It is the judgment of the best informed men in his state that Neeley cannot be beaten, and I know it to be a fact that Neeley and his friends were earnestly praying that Guy Despard would be the nominee against him, their theory being that he would be much the easiest man to defeat.

At one time they were seriously alarmed over the rumor that Mr. Hoover contemplated appointing Guy Despard to some highly dignified federal position which would enable him to live in Washington and at the same time remove him from the senatorial field. Knowing a little of the way Mr. Hoover feels toward Guy Despard, and recalling the bitter and burning words with which that gentleman assailed Herbert in the early days of 1928, both in the Senate and out, when Guy Despard was conducting his ridiculous (but not to him) campaign for the presidential nomination, I thought they were needlessly alarmed. Now Guy Despard voluntarily retires on the score of his health; but there is no prospect, I am told, that any other Republican candidate can head off the tireless Mr. Neeley, who has not let up for even a day in a long time. Further, I am told that the West Virginia delegation in the House, now composed of five Republicans and one Democrat, will be nothing like so solid next time. The state is in concededly bad shape, and a loss of two, possibly three, Republican members is anticipated. "We shall be lucky," said a West Virginia leader the other day, "if we can hold the delegation to an even split."

Now, when you add together the conditions in these states, the pessimistic feeling toward them evinced by the practical Republican politicians, and the demoralized party situation in New York and New Jersey, there seem to be enough grounds to form an opinion. Mine is that there is a very real chance for the Democrats to gain control of the House. Primarily, I think, the causes of the distinct Democratic trend have nothing to do with the tariff, the World Court, Mr. Huston, Judge Parker or any of the other issues about which the Senate anti-administration choir has been singing. These have a tendency to make the Hoover administration seem ineffective and unsuccessful, but they are not basic reasons. Much more accurate it is to assume that the fundamental trouble is the widespread unemployment which undoubtedly exists.

To this must be added the extraordinary and conceded increase in the militancy of Wet sentiment. For the first time the Wets within the Republican party are evincing a disposition not to drop their convictions on this issue in order to be regular Republicans on election day. It will be interesting to see, in Illinois, New Jersey, Massachusetts and several other Wet states where the issue will be sharply drawn between a Wet Democrat and a Dry Republican, how much this disposition means in votes. And so, despite their extraordinary House majority, Republican leaders are deeply worried about the fall elections, and are far more concerned about retaining House control than they have been in any off year for a long time. A boom in business before November, with the consequent disappearance of unemployment, would certainly improve their prospects, would probably wipe out the chances of the first Democratic House since 1916. But as things are today, the Republicans are worried, and with reason.

Washington. T. R. B.

Hotel Universe

Hotel Universe, by Philip Barry. Guild Theater, April 14, 1930.

MR. PHILIP BARRY, whose triumphant social comedies, "Paris Bound" and "Holiday," have shown so many delightful qualities and such secure theatrical elements, and have dealt with people so refreshing after the usual stage humanity, made perhaps his most successful flight toward high seriousness when he wrote "In a Garden." There were many moments of delicate poetry in that play, and many hints of a spirit fresh in our theater. Its weakest spots were due to a certain more or less literary quality not wholly realized in stage terms, and to a considerable looseness of mind, as mind appears in sheer dramatic structure or pattern.

"Hotel Universe," though less of a success, is essentially an advance over the earlier play. There are many beautiful spots in the writing, but I never felt them sinking into mere thematic effort or literary effect; they seem converted into the substance of the play. And the pattern of the play is simpler and straighter; in its own way it progresses with a fair security toward the dénouement. There is an advance, too, in the scope of the characters, and the range of life covered is more ambitious and more varied. The burden of meanings is more complex and extensive.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The scene is on the terrace of a villa on the French Riviera—a scene agreeably dramatized in Mr. Lee Simonson's settings—and the whole play happens during that evening in late July last summer. A group of young people, a married couple among them, have been visiting Ann Field for a week, and tonight they are talking together before they depart for Paris. The house has once been a hotel, and is said to have the power to appear to everyone as some other place important in his past experience, and in the eyes of an inmate to turn one person into another dear to his memory. Ann's father is a sort of madman, if you like, the relics of a genius in physics. For three years she has lived here with him. He exhibits supernatural powers of insight, or a gift for psychoanalysis, shall we say, carried to the utmost effectiveness. It is his influence on the various characters that is to make the grand catharsis at the end; and at the very end it is his cessation from which the new beginnings arise.

All except the young married woman, whose release in her maternal life, which includes her dreamer husband, frees her from the disaster, are filled with disillusion and with variations on the theme of suicide. Their thoughts on this subject are set into commotion by the incident of a young man who has leapt from a rock to his death, with an effective saying about being off to Africa. The sententious flair of this saying and the egoistical appeal of this tragedy establish a good deal of introspection and many pregnant pauses and silences among the group gathered on the evening terrace. One young man, Pat Farley—well played by Mr. Glenn Anders—loved Ann three years ago, but since then he has had a love affair at Oxford. He returned too late to the girl, who had shot herself under a hawthorne tree. Since then he cannot forget what a cad he is; he is, in fact, shortly to venture into high places in the Alps and there suffer a mysterious accident. One of the other characters is a successful actress in comedy. She remembers her father with a destroying passion of worship; life, since his death, seems futile and defeated. Another character is a Jew who has risen from a clerk in a fur store to the position of a great financier; and along with him is a luxurious beauty whom he desires but cannot—or so I took it, at least—bring himself to marry, because she means nothing ambitious for him. There is, finally, the young husband who dreams of being alone but brings nothing back from it that his wife can see; he is haunted by the memory of a priest who once had a great influence over his mind and whom he almost followed into the priesthood.

The whole first part of the play is taken up with these people's relations to one another, their quips and cracks, and their variations on the death theme. The rest of the play exhibits the father's powers and insights. There is a sequence of scenes in which, taking one character after another, he carries each back to a former experience, now so inhibitive and destroying, and releases him from it.

At the last curtain, Pat Farley, released from the picture of himself that he was carrying around with him, returns to Ann, and her father, no longer needed by her, lets death take him at last.

The ambition in "Hotel Universe" runs high, as is evident. Its forefathers in world drama can be noted here and there, in Russia, Germany, most of all in Strindberg. It is nothing against Mr. Barry to say that; he has made the method his own. The meaning of the play will vary with different spectators. As the program points out, it may mean to some that the wound from many an experience would be healed if we could relive it in the light of more adult experience. There are many other implications more difficult to express in a few words than they are to grasp in the author's creation—which is as it should be. The general feeling throughout the play is that of the shining and infinite possibilities in life, once we are free of the probable, literal and set.

The method used in "Hotel Universe" Mr. Barry, as I have said, has made his own. If he had made it his own in a profounder sense we would have had a different play. He has made it his own in an innermost sense, I do believe. I am prepared to believe that he is capable of feeling both the pathos and the poetry of his themes and characters, as well as of inventing for them their shiny and uncertain stage faces. But what has happened is that he has made the method his own very often only in that wretched personality sense that our theater stresses and exploits, and that we are all familiar with. In sum, though the first third of "Hotel Universe" purports to be serious matter and employs the method of Chekhov and other serious dramatists, it is sprinkled with the familiar graces of Philip Barry—little epigrams, fresh retorts and wise-cracks, and, above all, that trick he has developed, often delightfully where it is not too coy, of two characters suddenly beginning to act a little dialogue or number of their own. The first instance in "Hotel Universe," in which they tease the Jew, is tiresome and obvious theater coquetry; it only hurts the second, where the three men return to their boyhood and where a genuine dramatic comment on them is established. We cannot believe in the sadness of any of those people on the stage, except the actress in Miss Ruth Gordon's hands, and there, to tell the truth, the sadness was easier to write; it is mostly a complex about her actor-father and a prose disillusion with life. You cannot be arch, witty and delightful, flitting into your most marketable effects one minute, and the next minute demand that we be moved into any sort of belief or devotion. The belief asked of us for "Hotel Universe" is fantasy, to be sure, a release in dreams and possibility; but the means toward such an effect are, in their special way, as perilous as any realism. One scene only in the play has complete conviction and dramatic pathos, and this is due partly to Miss Ruth Gordon's remarkable, and Mr. Morris Carnovsky's more than adequate, playing of it, and partly to the dramatist's creative gift. This is the scene in which the old man brings back to the actress an evening with her father as it really was: a ham actor; his perversity, cruelty and egotism, and her final disgust and flight. This moment in "Hotel Universe" is one of the best in the season's theater.

There are, nevertheless, many beautiful and lustrous passages in Mr. Barry's play, alongside the flirtations, the triteness and the semi-adolescence. It seems to me a play that marks his own growth and promise, and one he needed to write, as well as one the Theater Guild should do. But not now. The play needed to be kept a few years, and seen then in the light that the dramatist himself has taken for his text. As it stands, however, "Hotel Universe" serves some purpose in our drama. It moves aside from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our realistic method, which, except when great courage, skill and thought are brought to it—and this happens almost never—is only a prose prison, an innocent, half-journalistic and stale escape from saying anything about life.

Even the experiment of giving the whole long play without an intermission seemed to me worth trying. So far, we have had that effect in operas like "Parsifal," but with the persuasion of music and with more implication of spiritual excitement, stained glass and viscera. For a play that is alive throughout and a little shorter than Mr. Barry's, there is much to be said in favor of this unbroken presentation.

STARK YOUNG.

CORRESPONDENCE

Cheap Books and Union Printers

SIR: The April 16 issue of The New Republic features Dr. C. A. Beard's book as a subscription offer on account of "the present astonishingly low price. . . ." In a recent issue of The Publishers' Weekly the printer, a Tennessee press, seeks business on its record in handling this cheap edition of Beard's "Rise of American Civilization."

I do not know this particular Tennessee press. I do know, however, that Tennessee presses in general have the reputation in the trade of extra-cheap prices, because, among other things, of a labor supply and point of view resembling that much discussed of late in connection with Southern textile mills.

I am not in sympathy with some of the more extreme regulations of the New York printing trades. I favor cheaper prices for books. In other words, the circumstances surrounding the printing of this particular book appear to exhibit interestingly the predicament of those who pick, as we all must, a difficult course through our knock-kneed institutional world.

I suspect that Mr. Beard's book could not have had its gratifying distribution through this cheap edition at a price low enough to qualify as a "Book of the Month" if the book had been printed in New York City, or possibly even in New Jersey, Pennsylvania or up-state New York. In that case The New Republic's "extraordinary offer" might not have been possible.

How do The New Republic and Mr. Beard rationalize this particular case?

New York City. ROBERT S. LYND.

SIR: Thanks for sending on to us Mr. Lynd's very fair inquiry of April 11. I am sending a copy of this letter, together with yours and Mr. Lynd's, to Mr. Beard for his information and comment, if he cares to make any—although it should be clearly understood that he had nothing whatever to do with the placing of the printing order for his book and probably did not even know, until after the work was done, where the printing took place.

Certain considerations other than the cost of labor entered into the placing of this work with a Tennessee press. It so happened that, at the time the work was placed with them, they were running into a relatively slack season, and it is common for printing establishments, like other manufacturing plants, to be willing at such times to take on large contracts at considerably lower than normal figures for the sake of keeping their people employed and their machinery busy. It was this, rather than any permanent advantage on the part of an outlying press, that determined the contract for the manufacture of the Beard book.

As a general rule, presses paying the union scale or higher in closer proximity to New York are able to compete quite successfully with establishments like the Tennessee plant in question. There are an infinite number of considerations which enter into the placing of printing contracts, some of which may easily outweigh advantages in wage scale maintained by the remote establishments. Close proximity, as a rule, means quicker and better service, and there are many questions of special equipment, shipping facilities, quality of workmanship and general plant efficiency which have to be considered. As a matter of fact, on sheer price alone the advantages are by no means always with the remote press—even though its wage scale may be lower.

Partly as a matter of policy and partly as a matter of sheer economic advantage, well over 90 percent of the work of this company is done in manufacturing establishments which pay the union scale or better, and I see no reason to suppose that this is likely to change in the near future. Occasionally, however, a special enterprise, such as this cheap edition of "The Rise of American Civilization" comes along, where it seems advantageous to use the remote establishment.

As Mr. Lynd is kind enough to suggest, "cheap books, as well as high wages are socially desirable," and, again to use his phrase, in steering "a difficult course through our knock-kneed institutional world" we chose to follow the course which promised the cheaper books. Whether, from the point of view of public policy, this was the wisest course, we must leave to wiser philosophers than ourselves!

CURTICE N. HITCHCOCK,
Vice-President, The Macmillan Company.

New York City.

[The New Republic does not have, and will not have, any of its own printing done in non-union establishments. Whatever influence it exercises upon others it will use in behalf of the same policy. It does not believe, however, that the social obligation of adherents of unionism extends so far as to require boycotting valuable publications which have emanated from non-union presses. Here the desirability of the circulation of enlightenment conflicts with the interests of trade-unionism, and seems to us to have the right of way. Incidentally, we wish to emphasize Mr. Hitchcock's point that low wages and non-union conditions do not, ordinarily, make cheaper printing. The dilemma stated by Mr. Lynd is not often a real one—THE EDITORS.]

De Gustibus Est Disputandum

SIR: I hesitate to question the evidently varied epicurean experience of Mr. Sheean [The New Republic, April 2], but in the matter of poor food it seems to me that again we have not yet attained parity with the mother country. If raw apples are unobtainable here, did Mr. Sheean ever try to get a glass of cold, raw milk in England? If he objects to "remorselessly iced water," has he ever obtained water, iced or otherwise (except boiling, for tea) in an English restaurant? Has he ever obtained a drink of beer or ale colder than lukewarm in that country where ice is practically unknown? No wonder foreigners in England take so readily to the tea habit. It's the only drink that isn't absolutely impossible.

Our menu cards may have "an appalling uniformity," but you need read only the first words of an English card and you can supply the rest. "Roast beef" always takes Yorkshire pudding and two vegetables, while "roast lamb" is invariably accompanied by mint sauce and two vegetables. While still unsophisticated I used to inquire what the two vegetables would be. I very soon learned that the English know only three vegetables—potatoes and two kinds of cabbage. There are beans, of course, but they always come in cans marked "Clark's of Canada," and one wonders why they were ever persuaded to make the long trip. Lettuce, even of "the taste and consistency of a new baseball," would be nectar to one after a month in England, while all our salads based upon it are, of course, conspicuously absent. As for dessert, I challenge Mr. Sheean to say that he prefers one of those ubiquitous, tasteless suet puddings to a dish of plain ice cream.

Mr. Sheean's comments about our hotels call to mind English hotels where the only heat obtainable comes from the large fire in the lounge and a hot-water bottle or metal bed-warmer in your bed, the last an instrument of torture which one alternately reaches for and casts away through sleepless winter nights. Not that there are no steam-heating systems in England, but these

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are usually sabotaged by the English, so that, literally sitting on the cold radiator, they may be able to say, "If this is your steam heat, we'll have none of it!" One could add comfort after comfort which one seeks in vain in England, until one realizes why Englishmen colonized the world. It's a wonderful country—to come from.

JOSEPH J. SENTURIA.

Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Jew and Arab in Palestine

SIR: As president of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, it is my duty to lay before the American public a statement concerning some of the points raised by the "Report of the Commission on the Palestine Disturbances of August, 1929."

The task set the Commission by the British government was to "inquire into the immediate causes which led to the recent outbreak in Palestine and to make recommendations as to the steps necessary to avoid a recurrence." The commissioners have found that "the outbreak in Jerusalem . . . was from the beginning an attack by Arabs on Jews," and that the further riots also "took the form, for the most part, of a vicious attack by Arabs on Jews accompanied by a wanton destruction of Jewish property." We never doubted that this was the case, but we welcome the facts, having now been officially established.

The Prime Minister stated in the House of Commons on April 3 that the government is now studying the various recommendations of the Commission with a view to dealing with the immediate causes of the outbreak and to preventing a recurrence. We have full confidence that the question of security will be satisfactorily solved by his Majesty's government.

While we are by no means prepared to accept all the findings of the Commission upon the immediate causes of, and responsibility for, the outbreak, it is the part of the report that goes beyond the terms of reference laid down by the Secretary of State which, in our view, most urgently calls for a reply. The Commission has thought it necessary to enter upon major questions of policy, such as land settlement and immigration matters reserved to his Majesty's government and (with the exception of Mr. Snell, whose "Note of Reservations" is a document alive with human sympathy), the commissioners have done so in a manner which shows a complete lack of understanding of the world-wide Jewish problem for which a remedy is being sought in Palestine as well as of the solemn international pledges which form the basis of Great Britain's mandatory responsibilities.

"The outbreak," says the report, "neither was, nor was intended to be, a revolt against British authority in Palestine." This statement ignores the fundamental fact that the very justification of British authority over Palestine is in the mandate which is the charter of the National Home for the Jewish people. The report finds the fundamental cause of the outbreak in "the Arab feeling of animosity and hostility towards the Jews, consequent on the disappointment of their political and national aspirations and the fear for their economic future," and adds in another connection that the "great benefits" conferred on the country by Jewish immigration and Jewish work "have been, as it were, incidental to the main purpose of the enterprise, and did not form part of the original design." This is indeed an amazing comment on the policy of the Jewish National Home; for, while we are glad that our work by its very nature benefits the Arab population, and it is our intention that it should, we cannot accept the premise implied in this and other passages of the report that our right to live in Palestine is affected by fears entertained, or dependent on advantages derived, by its Arab inhabitants. On the strength of our historical connection with Palestine, a national home was assigned to us in that country by the unanimous verdict of the civilized world. We are in Palestine "as of right, and not on sufferance."

I do not propose to deal with all the points in the report which can, and will, be challenged on grounds of fact, but I must refer particularly to two points. It is said that "Palestine cannot support a larger agricultural population than it at present carries, unless methods of farming undergo a radical change . . ." but the very essence of our work is precisely to produce such "a radical change," and after fifty years' experience of our colonization we affirm that room can be found for tens of thousands of additional Jewish farmers in the country without infringing on the legitimate interests of the Arabs. The report alleges against us that we are creating a landless proletariat. In reality the total of Arab tenants displaced by us is small, and the overwhelming majority of them have been, with our assistance, reëstablished on the land. Further, we contend that there was no connection between these alleged agrarian grievances and the disturbances of August, 1929. Among the hundreds of Arabs who have appeared in the law courts on charges of complicity in the riots there was not one who could be described as a tenant evicted by us. Had there been even a single case of that description, the most would have been made of it against us in the evidence before the Commission. The report suggests that Jewish immigration has exceeded the absorptive capacity of the country, and even charges the Jewish Agency with a serious departure from the agreement embodied in the White Paper of 1922. This allegation is based solely on the economic crisis of 1926-7. Whatever the causes of the crisis, there is no evidence of its having adversely affected the Arabs, while the Jewish unemployed were admittedly cared for by ourselves; and, whereas the richest countries in the world still struggle with acute unemployment, in Palestine there is now a shortage of labor. The balance of ten years of our work in Palestine is that, although the Jews have increased by 100,000, and the Arabs, whose numbers had previously been almost stationary, have also increased by 100,000, the entire population is now employed at wages and under conditions much better than were ever known in Palestine before.

The alleged fears of the Arabs "for the economic future" have led three commissioners to suggest that our immigration should be curtailed and our freedom to purchase land be restricted. There can be no national home without men and without land; and either limitation would mean for us a virtual canceling of the policy of the mandate, would reduce us to a position inferior to that which we face in any other country, and would turn the very name of the Jewish National Home into derision.

We welcome the declaration, made by the Prime Minister on April 3, that his Majesty's government stands by the policy of the mandate; and we welcome its endorsement by the leaders of the two oppositions. We Jews cannot wish for any greater assurance than we have received from the three responsible leaders of the British nation; and we look forward with the fullest confidence to the statement in which his Majesty's government will give a detailed and concrete exposition of its future policy in Palestine.

Meantime, I declare, in the name of the millions of Jews organized in the Jewish Agency for Palestine: It has been the privilege of our generation to set its hand to the work for which our ancestors have waited and prayed; and we do so under the auspices of the nation whom the united voice of world Jewry has asked to assume the mandate. We have laid the foundation of our national home in Palestine. The work which we have begun we shall continue. We shall not desert our ideal and our pioneers.

CHAIM WEIZMANN,

London. President, the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

On Circumstantial Evidence

SIR: The facts in connection with the trial and conviction of Mrs. Eva Dugan, who was executed at the Arizona State Prison on February 21, may be of interest as showing the kind of evidence on which the death penalty is sometimes imposed.

An aged recluse named Mathis disappeared from his ranch near Tucson in 1927. Mrs. Dugan, aged 50, who had been his housekeeper, disappeared shortly afterward in company with a youth known to the neighbors as Jack, who had been employed on the farm. She was arrested at White Plains, New York (where she was engaged in housework), was brought back to Tucson, tried for theft of the Mathis automobile, and sentenced to prison. A year later the body of Mathis was found buried in a shallow grave on the farm. Mrs. Dugan was then brought from prison, tried for murder and sentenced to death.

One damaging fact against Mrs. Dugan was her disappearance after the murder. Still, it proves nothing. She may have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

innocent, but terribly frightened lest she be accused, and, being ignorant, decided the safe thing was to get far away. She testified at the trial that Jack killed Mathis and compelled her to accompany him to Amarillo in the Mathis automobile. This might well be true. If Jack was the murderer his best chance of safety was to take her away under such circumstances that she could not report the murder without bringing suspicion upon herself. Neighbors testified at her trial that Jack told them Mathis had gone to California on a business trip. It seems most probable that Jack committed the murder and told a falsehood to cover up the crime until he could get well out of reach. He has not been captured.

Some citizens of Tucson, and Mrs. Heywood Broun, who happened to be in the city, made an eleventh-hour effort to save Mrs. Dugan from the gallows. An insanity hearing was secured. The prison physician, the former warden, the present warden and the state psychiatrist all testified to their belief that she had become insane while in prison. The jury, nevertheless, decided that she was sane.

The writer does not contend that this woman was innocent. The circumstances of the murder raise a suspicion of guilt which would have fully justified keeping her in confinement pending the discovery of other evidence. But surely it is essential to the safety of innocent people everywhere that the death penalty should not be imposed on circumstantial evidence, even if it is much stronger than it was in this case.

Denver, Col. F. S. KINDER.

An Invitation to Sonneteers

SIR: The Williamsburg News, Brooklyn, New York, is offering a prize of one hundred dollars for the best sonnet on international peace and good will. The editor of The News has received numerous sonnets from all parts of the country and Canada. Although the sonnets submitted show an earnest desire on the part of the contestants for international peace and good will, very few of them have any esthetic value, and only one or two contain an original thought that is worthy of the attention of serious-minded judges.

In view of the fact that the editor intends to publish an anthology of the hundred best peace sonnets submitted in the contest, he has decided to extend the time limit from April 1 to June 1, with the purpose of attracting as many nationally known and unknown poets as possible.

All communications should be addressed to The Williamsburg News, 977 Broadway, Brooklyn, New York.

DAVID GEORGE PLOTKIN,
Brooklyn, N. Y. Editor.

The Chinese Famine

SIR: The small attention that the famine in China is receiving is not at all amazing. There is nothing in it for anybody—that is why nobody does anything about it. The reasons you give for this indifference [The New Republic, April 16] are excellent—and thoroughly rotten. If there were something in it—something, that is, besides being merely decent to life, even Chinese life—you'd see how fast the impossible would be accomplished. If it involved a little war, for instance, you'd see how fast loaded ships would whizz across the seas.

"Relief is impossible." How easy to welcome defeat when there is nothing to gain! "Bandits would probably seize the supplies." There must be bogey men there, too. Your final disposition of the matter makes everything all right. These living organisms are not people; they are excess population. So scientific are we become that we can be as impersonally fiendish as Evolution. Soon we shall be able to contemplate all pain and torture as lovely abstractions. We shall offer our analysis brightly: "That is agony!"

If you could somehow make our war god believe that the chaste maid Democracy was being devoured in the Chinese interior, in lieu of bread, you'd see how fast the grain would get there. The Marines would handle the bandits with one hand.

Passaic, N. J. CELIA SALKIN.

The Crime of Not Being Anglo-Saxon

SIR: Since Mr. Seward Collins [The New Republic, April 16] has seen fit to couple my letter with his side-stepping of Mr. Malcolm Cowley's article, may I again avail myself of your misguided, unhumanist "generosity to highly individualized opinions," and add a few words in my own behalf to Mr. Cowley's reply?

Apparently Mr. Collins' innocence of the meaning of his own words is a convenient mechanism, capable of extension to the words of others. Mr. Collins knows very well that I was not concerned in making an issue of his anti-Semitism, though his reckless manifesto amply supported such a charge. If he feels that my original citation on that score needs any reinforcement, let him reread his apocalyptic vision of the dire fate awaiting Mr. Mencken in the Humanist thirties, when The Mercury will be read only by "the backgroundless, the disinherited, the pathological, first-generation immigrants, unhappy college boys, paranoic newspaper reporters, intellectual bohemians." Surely a flattering category, and in no way reflecting Mr. Collins' opinion of "first-generation immigrants"! Poor misunderstood Mr. Collins! A modern Balaam—he opens his mouth to bless the Children of Israel, but somehow only curses reach *their ears!*

Brooklyn, N. Y. ALTER BRODY.

Hard Times in Indiana

SIR: Your readers may be interested in the enclosed letter from the Mayor of Evansville, Indiana, which throws some light on conditions of unemployment at the present time.

DARWIN J. MESEROLE,
President, National Unemployment League.

New York City.

[ENCLOSURE]

Gentlemen:

I have your general letter of April 11 in which you ask for the business conditions in our city as well as the conditions of unemployment.

Our city administration changed the first of this year and since the political complexion also changed, we were in a position where we were absolutely overwhelmed by men seeking employment. We have in this city exclusive of our police and fire departments fewer than 200 employees. I had approximately 4,000 applications. I have listened to more stories of real distress than I thought could possibly exist in America. This demand has been so insistent that I have had little time to give to the serious duties of my office, although I am not attempting to select labor for our various departments. I refer these applicants to the various departments and failing to find work, they return to me. I have callers at my home and my phone even at home rings almost incessantly, due to calls for men who need employment or their wives who recite their distress and needs. The whole thing is a nightmare, but I am able to absorb scarcely any of this labor and when I do help a man find a job, it is usually at the expense of some other fellow being thrown out of work.

I have had applications from college men, accountants and school teachers who are willing to accept the lowest type of employment to earn bread and clothing for their families. Very few of our industries are running full time or with their full quota of labor. Evansville has quite a diversity in its industries, but all branches seem to be suffering. The relief is beyond our power to supply.

I would gladly recommend to our boards that they undertake unusual developments in order to give employment, but we stumble into the fact that in our budget funds were not provided for such improvements. We have much work that might be done and improvements that are highly desirable, but we find ourselves unable to finance them. I wish that I were economist enough to suggest a solution.

It appears to me that it is going to be a long time before we snap out of it and that the process of recovery is going to be slow and gradual. In the meantime there is bound to be a great deal of suffering.

FRANK W. GRIESE,
Evansville, Ind. Mayor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Grain of Things

The Sciences and Philosophy: Gifford Lectures, University of Glasgow, 1927-1928, by J. S. Haldane. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 330 pages. $3.75.

The Function of Reason, by Alfred North Whitehead. Louis Clark Vanuxem Foundation Lectures. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 72 pages. $1.50.

DURING the nineteenth century a curious thing happened in the world of thought: philosophy abdicated. The dominant philosophers of the century, the Comtes, the Mills, the Spencers, took their cue from science, and avoided inquiries which were not directly comprehensible in terms of science. So far as their philosophies still have significance, it is chiefly because they sought to formulate the rationale of the scientific method. Science and truth were synonymous; and because philosophy was not science it ceased, according to the prevailing conception, to be truth.

During the last generation, a great change has taken place in the realm of ideas. Partly under the influence of profound scientific minds, like Clerk Maxwell, Mach and Poincaré, the limitations of science itself have been more clearly understood: its laws are approximations, its categories are practical conveniences, rather than insights into the ultimate nature of things: and as it becomes more rigorous in method, it is forced to exclude the complex and the anomalous. In short: the scientific picture of the world is as selective as the artist's picture; and just as the painter has to ignore in his symbol the change of colors and the movements of his forms, to say nothing of matters like odor and heat, so the scientist is compelled for his purposes to limit experience to those aspects which may be quantitatively handled and repeated. "Evidence which lies outside the method," as Dr. Whitehead points out, "simply does not count."

Instead of looking upon a rigorous scientific statement as an exhaustive account of a phenomenon, we have at last come to recognize the clipped and conventional quality of such reports. As a result of this perception, philosophy, beginning particularly with Bergson and Croce, has recovered a little of its own self-respect: for its claim is to deal with the totality of human experience, including the limited part of it which comes under the province of science. This change has not merely taken place among the traditional philosophers: it has been abetted by a succession of scientific thinkers, who have turned the guns of science upon their own citadel: Eddington in astro-physics, Lloyd Morgan in biology, J. S. Haldane in physiology, Whitehead in mathematics, have shown the crudeness and the metaphysical dogmatism of Newtonian science—which hitherto was another name for exact truth. "The Sciences and Philosophy" and "The Function of Reason" are both pertinent examples of the way in which philosophy is reclaiming the place which science so confidently preëmpted on the basis of its pragmatic applications.

Dr. Haldane's book, first given in the Gifford Lectures for 1927-1928, is an elaboration of the thesis which he presented in "Life, Mechanism and Personality" (1913). The philosophical point of view has not changed; but it is enriched with additional scientific evidence, based upon a series of brilliant experimental researches upon breathing. The sum of this evidence is to show that, as physiological research becomes more exact in technique, a purely physical or chemical interpretation of organic life becomes less and less tenable. What happens in a living organism has no counterpart in the inorganic world: the facts of organic balance and the maintenance of specific structure, to say nothing of the constant implication of the organism and its environment, are peculiar to life.

Rejecting a mechanistic biology, Dr. Haldane is equally firm against any of the current theories of vitalism, which assume the existence of an entelechy or soul within the living organism, which directs its physical processes. In essentials, vitalism explains nothing; and it only claims to function at points where the mechanical-physical explanation seems to break down: whereas Dr. Haldane's contention is that a mechanistic theory is out of touch with the actual operations of the organism all along the line. Life, according to him, occurs as a specific whole, in which the parts and actions are essentially related to one another and cannot be isolated without destroying their nature. "Biologists are, and always have been, progressively tracing the specific coördination which shows itself in the structure, activities and environment of living organism. This coördination cannot be expressed in terms of ordinary physical and chemical conceptions." There is no common term which would connect the so-called physical world with the world of purpose and interest and value which is, for Dr. Haldane, the central fact of human experience. Hence, in the second half of his book, he endeavors to provide such a common basis.

Here Dr. Haldane enters on difficult ground; and one cannot pretend that he is altogether successful. Let us grant that he has shown that we know the physical universe only as the environment of life, and that it is an abstraction when separated from the observer. Let us grant, further, that he has proved that there is an essential difference between the behavior of physical bodies and the behavior of organisms. Let us admit, finally, that his philosophy, since it includes interests and values, purpose and personality, is capable of subsuming more relations and covering the thick reality of experience more adequately than a philosophy which ignores these elements. We are now brought up against a final question: What is the nature of the world from which the physicist derives one series of constructions, the biologist another and the artist or philosopher a third? Is one of these aspects supremely real, or are we dealing with a whole, in which each aspect authenticated by experience is equally real?

We know the answer of Newtonian science to these questions: namely, the physical world of separate bodies is alone real; life, interest, value, are incidental by-products, or anomalous eventualities. Dr. Haldane unfortunately goes to the other extreme. He says: "The universe as it is assumed to be in physical science is only an idealized world, while the real universe is the spiritual universe in which spiritual values count for everything." This seems to me a shocking piece of inconsequence. There is no surer fact of existence than the fact that spiritual values do not count for everything: that we live in a world whose orderly development towards what Whitehead calls "life, a good life, and a better life," is embarrassed by chance and accident. It is just as serious a matter to exclude these elements as it is to exclude interest and value. We can absorb great tracts of the physical world, make it intelligible and significant, and, through the arts, subdue the environment to human ends: but we do not make that part which opposes spirit less formidable by saying that it is ultimately spiritual or exists in the original nature of God. Such a doctrine forgets the brute immediacy of "matter," which remains the same whether it be interpreted as solidly as Democritus' atoms or as tenuously as Eddington's, and it neglects the devilment which is bound up with every just conception of deity! The deepest problems of life are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

raised by the fact that the grain of things does not all run in the same direction. Charles Pierce was nearer the obdurate truth when he proclaimed that love *and* chance govern the universe. Such a world may not be wholly coherent; but coherence is a human demand, and in the long run it must bow to what *is*.

Dr. A. N. Whitehead's little treatise on "The Function of Reason" is one of those satellite books which the weighty planet of his mind casts off from time to time: it offers to the unskilled reader who has neither the philosophic background nor the patience to master "The Concept of Nature" or "Process and Reality" an opportunity to survey a smaller but nearer province of Dr. Whitehead's audacious and brilliant mind. For Dr. Whitehead, the function of reason is to promote the art of life; and it has two especial provinces, that typified by Ulysses, the sagacious and practical Reason, discriminating among the immediate arrangements of life, and that of Plato, the speculative type, which ranges in a lordly way over territories beyond the local horizon. The first is as old as man; the second has been in existence only a few thousand years. In developing his theme, Dr. Whitehead has occasion to criticize the Malthusian doctrine of the survival of the fittest, to reinstate the doctrine of final causes, to point out the inadequacy of a scientific methodology which excludes a good half of human experience, and to take issue with the obscurantism of a complacently limited science. His touch is sure; his observations penetrating; his insights are deep; and, needless to say, his attacks upon the scientific dogma of our time are in the interests, not of a lower form of superstition, but of a higher and more comprehensive conception of truth.

With a little of Dr. Whitehead's tough-mindedness, the latter part of Dr. Haldane's book would have been as sound and irrefutable as the first part of it. But one must be thankful that both of these thinkers have gone as far as they have. We are gradually becoming enlightened about the nature of our scientific enlightenment; and we have discovered that science, like patriotism, is not enough. This does not mean that we timorously renounce the conquests of science: it merely means that we must cultivate other gardens, too. LEWIS MUMFORD.

A Beam of Light

Emily Dickinson: The Human Background of Her Poetry, by Josephine Pollitt. New York: Harper and Brothers. 350 pages. $4.

SECRETS enchanted Emily Dickinson. She shared, too, her father's reserve. But such of her poems and letters as her family has reluctantly given to the world suggest that Emily's love of privacy was matched by a hatred of evasion, subterfuge and futile mystery-making. The facts which it was either not proper or not necessary to publish during her lifetime should, at this date, be known to all who care for that subtle, witty and independent spirit. The persistent effort to becloud those facts has naturally resulted in rather wild speculations, some of them more damaging to Emily's character than any statement of the truth could be.

Miss Pollitt's effort to unravel the mystery was evidently undertaken as reverently as any devotee of Emily's could wish, and pursued with scholarly patience. She had to climb around the major obstacle confronted by every student of Emily Dickinson's life: the unwillingness of those who know most to say anything. Then, too, she was prohibited from quoting important source material. Her book is significantly prefaced by this statement:

> The material for this book is entirely the result of research, verified, wherever necessary and possible, by responsible persons. My interpretation of Emily Dickinson and of the influences upon her is offered as a suggestion. This short study of the human background of Emily Dickinson's poetry is incomplete without "The Life and Letters of Emily Dickinson," by Martha Dickinson Bianchi, Houghton Mifflin, 1924; "The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson," with an introduction by Martha Dickinson Bianchi, Little, Brown and Company, 1924; "Further Poems of Emily Dickinson," edited by Martha Dickinson Bianchi and Alfred Leete Hampson, Little, Brown and Company, 1929; from which I am not permitted by the copyright owners to make quotations. . . .

It may be noted in passing that the recently published sixth edition of the "Life and Letters" contributes nothing new to what the previous editions volunteered. The publication of "Further Poems," after the issuing of the "Complete Poems," makes one wonder, however, whether there may not be forthcoming "Last Poems," Final Poems," "Ultimate Poems," and so forth, which may throw more light on Emily's biography than we have yet been vouchsafed.

In spite of difficulties sufficient to enrage any less polite investigator, Miss Pollitt has succeeded in developing a plausible thesis to the effect that Emily's lover was not, as has been intimated by her official biographer, a Philadelphia preacher, but rather, Major Edward Bissell Hunt, the first husband of Emily's childhood friend, Helen Fiske, later the well known novelist, Helen Hunt Jackson. Miss Pollitt furnishes substantial evidence for her case. She notes, among other factors, that Emily's great confidant, Colonel Higginson, believed Major Hunt to have been the person of chief importance to Emily; that letters from Emily to Mrs. Hunt (later Mrs. Jackson), marked by that lady for posthumous publication, have never been printed; that Emily suffered from a long illness, the duration of which, if dates mean anything, seems traceable to the shock of Major Hunt's sudden death; that Amherst considered Emily the prototype for the heroine of Helen Hunt Jackson's novel, "Mercy Philbrick's Choice," which is suggestive of a similar situation; finally, that the internal evidence of Emily's poems shows her to have been influenced by a man of Major Hunt's mental equipment and one having, furthermore, some of Major Hunt's experiences. Miss Pollitt not only assembles her evidence convincingly, but draws clear portraits of the chief actors in the triangular drama, as well as of several others who played an important part in Emily's meager life. Oddly enough, however, one is not shown the Sister Sue who was Emily's closest intimate and the recipient of those terse lyric missives which have become the chief jewel of American poetry.

Miss Pollitt's study, for want of all the evidence, cannot be conclusive, but it is extremely plausible. Unfortunately, it is rather awkwardly presented. It lacks the coherence and the thorough integration that its subject matter requires. The author hesitates between an affectation of Emily's own lightning flashes and a rather barren narrative style, with unhappy results. Her book is less a tribute to, or an analysis of, the poet than a broad beam of light thrown upon the dismal obscurity in which her life has been shrouded. For that beam one is deeply grateful, but at the same time one is sensible that the biography of Emily Dickinson is still to be written. BABETTE DEUTSCH.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tidings from London

Vile Bodies, by Evelyn Waugh. New York: Jonathan Cape and Harrison Smith. $2.50.

Arm's Length, by John Metcalfe. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

HERE ARE two novels, one good, one bad, with no common denominator other than the fact that they were both written by Englishmen about contemporary London; curiously enough, the authors, in spite of having used widely different methods of approach and dissimilar social groups as material, manage to present an almost identical picture of the psychological state of affairs in the parent country. It is not, as a picture, particularly pretty; if their evidence is reliable, and there is no reason to suppose it is not, it is hard to see what keeps the U. S. S. R. from sending an army across the channel and swallowing up the whole works. Certainly neither Mr. Waugh's bright but *désoeuvrés* young fragments of the aristocratic tradition nor Mr. Metcalfe's dumb young bourgeoisie could do much in the way of stopping it. Aimless, amiable, with only a sense of humor to keep them from complete disintegration, their one idea would seem to be: eat, drink and be as inconsequent as possible, for tomorrow, if not today, we go to the dogs.

Apart from its title, "Vile Bodies" is a diverting and humorous book. Mr. Waugh is much more successful than William Gerhardi in the use of fantastic comedy as a method of satire; he distorts and exaggerates to his heart's content, but his characters always remain, like Beerbohm's, fundamentally plausible. So plausible are a good many of them that the precaution of setting the action, or inaction rather, of the book an indefinite number of years ahead would seem to be simply a device for avoiding the displeasure of friends, or the danger of libel suits. One needs only to read the London weeklies to find vindication, in gossip columns which are not unlike the inspired writings of Lord Balcairn for The Daily Excess, of the doings of Agatha Runcible and Miles Malpractice and Lady Metroland. They are as contemporaneous as Mrs. Melrose Ape, the lady evangelist, and her corps of frail angels from this side of the water, and much more convincing. Even the party at Anchorage House . . . "'Can't you just *see* the ghosts?' Mrs. Hoop said to Lady Circumference on the stairs. 'Pitt and Fox and Burke and Lady Hamilton and Beau Brummel and Dr. Johnson (a concurrence of celebrities, it may be remarked, at which something memorable might surely have occurred). Can't you just *see* them—in their buckled shoes?'" But this is Mr. Waugh in sentimental mood, lamenting, not without just reason, the passing of the old London, the London of solid virtue and stability, of courage and common sense. He believes that it is gone; to get it back, or at least an approximation of it, he proposes in the last chapter another war of large proportions. He does not, however, make it clear just how, or of what, this would be a solution.

"Arm's Length" is a bird of a different feather. There is very little to be said about it except that the characters are as dull a collection of futilitarians as can be found anywhere outside of actual existence; the story is concerned with the adventures of an exasperating young introvert who can never make up his mind. He drifts into marriage, into several jobs, into adultery; ultimately he finds himself to be tangled up in a murder case and about to become the father of a child by his mistress, as well as by his wife, at one and the same time. If there are possibilities in the latter situation, the author completely misses them; after the first hundred pages the reader has lost interest in Gerald and his moonings and wishes fervently that somebody would quickly push him, since he hasn't the mind to do it himself, into the nearest lake.

HOWARD COXE.

Anthologies, Good and "Bad"

Imagist Anthology: 1930, with a preface by Ford Madox Ford. New York: Covici-Friede. 229 pages. $3.50.

The Stuffed Owl, an Anthology of Bad Verse, edited by D. B. Wyndham Lewis and Charles Lee. New York: Coward-McCann. 236 pages. $2.50.

THE PUBLICATION of another Imagist anthology, after an interval of thirteen years or so, is a gallant and delightful gesture. As Mr. Ford observes in his amusing preface, much literary debris has gone under bridges in those thirteen years: Futurism, Cubism, Vorticism, Dadaism—and perhaps we can add Super-realism—have in turn burst upon us like so many bright Apollos, only to be rolled downstream like corpses. And here, on the other hand, is Imagism, which, if it is no longer living in any profound creative sense, is at any rate still alive in tradition. I suppose no critic would maintain that Imagism has given us great poetry, or a great poet, or even a great poem; the impulse was a minor and delicate one; and its principles, as we now see them, were conducive to the precise and the precious, the fragrant and fragile, rather than to anything profound or large. It was exactly these virtues which English poetry, in the years from 1914 to 1918, stood most in need of. And Imagism, in this sense, turns out to have been by no means the revolutionary affair which some of us at the time feared it to be: instead, it was a corrective critical process—a kind of deflation of a poetic currency which had become far too inflated.

What most surprises us—though I wonder whether it should—is that the Imagists themselves have, on the whole, changed so little. "H. D.," Aldington, Flint, Ford, Williams—they are still pretty much what we saw them to be in 1917. Their craftsmanship is perhaps keener, and possibly also we can detect a faint general drift towards a psychological awareness and attitude, as against the more purely esthetic and absolute, or "pure poetry," notions of the earlier period. Thus, there is certainly a deeper note of intellectual and psychological curiosity in Aldington, and a deeper dramatic quality in "H. D.," whose contribution to the present volume represents her at her very best. Fletcher, on the other hand, in abandoning his colorism for a poetry of social criticism, has not fared so well. As for Lawrence, who was never quite in this galley, and Joyce, who has no business to be, no comment is necessary. Altogether, they give us an admirable show; and they perhaps suggest, by turning up again so little changed or grown, that the doctrine *was* just a shade too cramping, as possibly any such corrective gesture must tend to be. Or is it simply that there is no great poet among them, no poet of the sort who changes and evolves from an inner center of necessity? It may be too soon to say.

If this is a good anthology, "The Stuffed Owl" is a magnificently and intoxicatingly and overwhelmingly and gloriously "bad" one. Why had no one ever thought before of compiling a collection of the world's worst? Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lewis and Mr. Lee have made, in doing so, a first-rate contribution to criticism. The book is much more than merely diverting: it is such a touchstone as Matthew Arnold, in his philosophy, never dreamed of. No poet should be without it. Kept beside the typewriter, it should give pause to many an acolyte, and save the world from many a monstrosity; though it is sad to think that—a hundred years from now—it might deprive the public of another such plum as this. The editors have made a delicious selection, and have provided their victims with bio-critical notes—or epitaphs—which are often exceedingly witty.

CONRAD AIKEN.

Rupert Hughes' Washington

George Washington: The Savior of the States, 1777-1781, by Rupert Hughes. New York: William Morrow and Company. 810 pages. $5.

A DEFINITIVE life of George Washington is probably impossible; there are too many quarrels to settle, too much contradictory evidence. To say that Mr. Hughes has done all that is possible, at least for now, is not begrudging him anything.

This is an exciting book. It is a fast-moving, keen, engrossing book. It is not written in any "new historical method"; the method, in fact, is what Mr. Ludwig would call old-fashioned. It has a big stride, an immense scope. Nothing is omitted; some may think that too much is included. One loses oneself in admiration of Mr. Hughes' gigantic industry; he has gone into every farthest recess of Washingtoniana; he has dug tirelessly; he has let nothing go unchallenged. If now and again he seems a little conscious of his own erudition, as, for example, when he includes a life of Scipio Africanus in his bibliography, one can still only heartily wish that more "modern" biographers could be found guilty of the same erudition.

Perhaps Mr. Hughes should have given less space to the minor battles, for his method of much documented writing somewhat stales the surge of fighting men; but his clarifying account of Monmouth and his chapter on the conduct of Charles Lee are more valuable than anything else that has been said on these singularly puzzling subjects. Still, one would like to know just what Mr. Hughes means when he speaks of Monmouth as "a clean triumph" for Washington. Certainly it was anything but "clean," and besides, the battle was a draw.

Mr. Hughes has been maligned again for "debunking" the Father of His Country—as he was in the cases of the first and second volumes of this "Life"—by the professional "patriots." The myths are dispelled, yes; but if George Washington ever emerged from any book as a hero, it was not from Weems, or Marshall, or Irving, or Lodge, but from Hughes. Here he is, a man—a man patient and irascible, calm and passionate, unassailable and weak, courageous and self-doubtful, standing lonely above the swarm of little men and corrupt politics. It is true to say that Hughes makes clear for the first time why Washington was so much loved and honored by those of his own generation.

This book will not displace for the interested reader those two fine biographies by Shelby Little and W. E. Woodward; but, henceforth, no man may dare to speak or write on Washington without having read Hughes and read him thoroughly.

JOHN HYDE PRESTON.

A Dull Series

The Heroic Age In India, a Comparative Study, by N. K. Sidhanta. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 232 pages. $4.50.

IN EVERY culture there is an age of battle which so impresses itself upon the folk tradition that it becomes the earliest focus of national feeling and produces the first literature. In India this age is celebrated by the Mahabharata epic, several times as voluminous as the Homeric poetry, and much more overlaid by the pietistic accretions of the Brahman caste, over the long period during which it established its superiority over the caste of knights. Here it tends to resemble (though Dr. Sidhanta does not dwell upon it, nor upon the fact that Exodus and The Kings are also epical books) the similar additions, commentaries and interpretations made by the scribes to the Bible literatures. Dr. Sidhanta's chief comparisons are with the European hero ages and their literature, of both of which he has a wide knowledge. He shows what was to be expected, that there are correspondences in form and resemblances in the ethics and social life which they severally reflected.

It cannot be said that Dr. Sidhanta makes an interesting book of it. That probably was not his purpose. The citation of authorities, the scholarly scruple to establish material facts, the discussion of the reliability of texts and the gentle and prolonged dribble of pros and cons of probable chronology and identity of personæ, reveal the determination to be erudite rather than interesting, to be read by fellow scholars rather than by a lay public, however intelligent. And, in fact, the subject itself, so minute a part of the vast, and to most of us, undiscovered world of Indian history and civilization, could interest only the specialist.

This book is a good example of the virtues and defects of the series of which it is the forty-seventh volume. At least one hundred and fifty more volumes are to be published.

When the "History of Civilization" series was first projected, it was impossible not to be enthusiastic over it. To many of us it seemed likely to mark, like the first encyclopedia, an epoch in the intellectual history of the world. It is perfectly clear, however, that there is no prospect of such a fortunate event. The scholarship has generally been high, but not faultless, as can be seen in the contradictory text and appendix of the volume on "The Ægean Civilization." And it has been in the main a purposeless scholarship, scholarship for scholarship's sake. It does not lead to any unifying generalization or outlook, or even to the desire to enlighten. What it does desire exclusively, it would seem, is to be formally correct. The writers—there are, of course, exceptions—seem to be guided by no more exalted ideal than the formidably documented Ph.D. thesis. The volumes by Rivers, Moret and Glotz, the most important, it is true, of the series, have been distinguished by competent writing. But some of the volumes, Parker's "A Thousand Years of the Tartars," and Delaporte's "Mesopotamia," for instance, are actually unreadable; and since writing still remains the vehicle of scholarship, bad writing will make a mess of even the soundest contributions.

The series has still two-thirds of its course to go. One wishes that the editors—unless they actually desire it to remain a group of scholar-to-scholar monographs—would consider the increasing lay public which is receptive to such an undertaking.

ISIDOR SCHNEIDER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes on Novels

Destiny, a Novel in Pictures, by Otto Nückel. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. $3.

A FULL-BODIED, old-fashioned, melodramatic romance giving the complete life of a girl from her birth in an attic to her suicide by leaping from the same type of lodging is here told in 187 lead cuts by the German artist, Otto Nückel. You get more in quantity here than you do in either of the other two picture novels which appeared the same season, that of Lynd Ward and that of Franz Masereel. Three times during the chronicle there are important deaths with coffins on the scene; in three episodes the police play a prominent part; three times the heroine allows love affairs to shape her destiny. There are fires and drownings and murders and bloodhounds and flights in trains, automobiles, buckboards and rowboats. There is a house of ill-fame with its social life pictured in detail. If the book seems to dwell too much on the morbid, murky side of life, we must remember that the heroine never attained a higher station than that of a tailor's wife. The pictures themselves are effective from the point of view of design and aside from their function of telling the story. Some of them have a grim humor.

C. A. C.

The Asking Price, by Helen Hull. New York: Coward-McCann. $2.50.

MISS HULL has gone steadily forward in a series of novels beginning with "Quest." They are all studies of American life, full of understanding and admirably written. In "The Asking Price" she enters a field well known to her. Oliver Gilbert is a young man of promising individuality who is drawn simultaneously into the mausoleum of a middle western college and the pink and whited sepulcher of marriage. His life in both tombs is treated with an abundance of illustration; but Miss Hull never loses her grasp of her theme. If "The Asking Price" lacks something of the appealing symbolism of "Islanders," it finds compensation in its informed realism.

R. M. L.

Contributors

ROBERT R. KUCZYNSKI, Council Member of the Brookings Institution at Washington, was formerly director of the municipal statistical office of Berlin-Schönesberg, Germany. He is the author of "The Balance of Births and Deaths." The substance of his article in this issue of The New Republic was delivered by him as an address in Chicago some time ago.

FRANCES PERKINS, the distinguished sociologist, is New York State Commissioner of Labor. She is the author of "The Problem of Mercantile Fire Hazards."

H. N. BRAILSFORD is an eminent English journalist and specialist in foreign affairs.

ROLAND R. RENNE is an assistant in the department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Wisconsin, where he has been aiding in a study of the tariff program.

BABETTE DEUTSCH, poet, novelist and critic, has lately published "Fire for the Night," a book of verse.

CONRAD AIKEN is the author of "Blue Voyage," "Costumes for Eros" and other books. His "Selected Poems" have recently been published.

JOHN HYDE PRESTON is a contributor to The Bookman, Transition and other periodicals. He is the author of a biography of Mad Anthony Wayne, "A Gentleman Rebel."

SYMPOSIUM & THEATRES

Six Splendid Speakers in One Splendid Evening

Symposium:

The NEW GENERATION

TOWN HALL—MONDAY; 8:30, MAY 5th

HARRY ELMER BARNES — FRITZ WITTELS
JOHN B. WATSON — SAMUEL SCHMALHAUSEN
SIDONIE GRUENBERG — VICTOR CALVERTON

Tickets: $1, $2, $3 — at Town Hall Box Office or Roxanna Wells Lecture Bureau, 393-7th Ave., N. Y. C.

THEATRE GUILD PRODUCTIONS

HOTEL UNIVERSE

A New Play by PHILIP BARRY

MARTIN BECK THEA. 45th St., West of Broadway. Evgs. 8:50; Mats. Thurs. & Sat. 2:50.

A MONTH in the COUNTRY

By IVAN TURGENEV

GUILD Theatre, 52nd Street, West of Broadway
Evenings 8:30 — Matinees Thurs. and Sat., 2:30

The Apple Cart

BERNARD SHAW'S POLITICAL EXTRAVAGANZA

ALVIN THEA. —52nd Street, West of Broadway.— Evgs. 8:30; Mats. Wed. & Sat. 2:30.

TIFFANY presents "JOURNEY'S END"

The all-talking screen version of R. C. Sherriff's World-Famed Play with a powerful cast headed by COLIN CLIVE, creator of the stage role of Captain Stanhope.

GAIETY THEATRE, Bway & 46th St., —Twice Daily 2:45—8:45—

3 times Sat., Sun., & Holidays, 2:45-5:45-8:45
Midnight Show Every Saturday Night
Seats selling 4 weeks ahead

LAST WEEK!

The Actor-Managers Inc., has the honor to present RUTH DRAPER IN HER ORIGINAL CHARACTER SKETCHES

Evgs., Tues., Wed., Fri., Sun., at 8:50

COMEDY Theatre 41st Street, East of Broadway. Matinees Thurs. and Sat. 2:30. VERY GOOD SEATS AT $1. Popular Price ($2.50). Matinee Saturday.

"Collective Farming"

the most exciting and significant problem now facing SOVIET RUSSIA explained in

"OLD AND NEW"

Sovkino Film Depicting the Struggle for Life

DIRECTED BY THE CREATOR OF "POTEMKIN" AND "TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD" S. M. Eisenstein

AMERICAN PREMIERE FRIDAY, MAY 2nd

R-K-O CAMEO THEATRE 42nd St. & B'way

Popular Prices

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMER PLACES

HAYFORD'S-IN-THE-FIELD
CHOCORUA, N. H.
Est. 1894

Situated in the foothills of the Sandwich Range of Mountains; innumerable long and short walks over well marked trails; centrally located for complete tour of White Mountains in a day; individual cottages; special attention given to families with children; meals served in the main house; vegetables from our own farm; milk and cream supplied from our own State and Federal Tubercular tested herd.

Reasonable rates, Booklet.

L. D. HAYFORD, Prop.

BROOK BEND TAVERN
Monterey, Massachusetts

A small quiet exclusive Inn high in the Berkshires. Golf—boating—swimming—excellent table, fresh vegetables, fruits, special diet menus.

ARNOLD INN
Northampton, Massachusetts

An All Year Round Guest House. Attractive single rooms and suites. Excellent Food. Reasonable Rates. Address:
Manager, Arnold Inn,
Northampton, Massachusetts.

Owl Head Camp
For Boys aged 9 to 15 years. On Lake Memphremagog in Canada. A Camp That Is Decidedly Different. SPECIALIZES IN HORSEMANSHIP AND POLO. $275. No extras. Address
Col. F. B. Edwards or H. B. Salman, Northfield, Vt.

BOYS' CAMP

Small private camp near Peekskill for a few boys, 7-12 years, excellent diet, vegetables, fruit, gardening, physical culture, artistic activities. Personal supervision by college trained woman. Address: Box 485,

FOR RENT

"The Quaker Lady," Remodeled Colonial farmhouse. Superb view Adirondacks. Beautifully furnished. Own spring. Barn. Orchard. 5 bedrooms and bath. Near Hurricane Lodge and Keens Valley. $500. Address: Mrs. John Martin, Grymes Hills, Staten Island, N. Y.

IN THE WOODS
ANNADALE, STATEN ISLAND

Bungalow for sale, rent—two bedrooms—porches, living-room, kitchen, bath, heat, electric light, water. Apply Jago, 954 Carlton Blvd., R.F.D. Prince Bay, Staten Island, N. Y.

Two cottages in attractive seclusion of New Jersey hills. Swimming and tennis. Rates $225 and $175 for season. For information write: R. Z. Angell, 113 Graham Street, New Brunswick, N. J.

4-room apartment, tastefully furnished, 2 rooms overlooking Hudson, near Columbia, cool, from June 1 to September 15. References. $400. Address: Box 481, The New Republic.

25 East 10th St., 10E. To sublet until Sept. 30, two rooms, kitchenette, bath, unfurnished, electrolux, two exposures, comparatively cool in summer, new well-run building, immediate possession with concessions. $110. After 11, Stuyvesant 7518.

DISCUSSION

THE GROUP
A Clearing House of Opinion
meets at
Auditorium—150 West 85th Street
Tuesday, May 6th, at 8:30 P. M.
FLOYD DELL
(Distinguished Author)
will speak on
"LOVE IN THE MACHINE AGE"

SPRING FESTIVAL
May 13th Entertainment and Dance
Admission
Members 50c Non-Members 75c
Membership dues for year, $1.00.
Weekly notices mailed on request
Organized 1818

TRAVEL

WANTED—A CHOICE SOUL—to travel in Europe with a group of ten persons—traveling in our own private automobiles. We have two luxurious limousines and there are two empty seats It's a pity not to have one of them used by some one who doesn't happen to know any one with whom to travel and yet hates the idea of a "tour." A young daughter would be welcome; an elderly but active mother; a man and wife who would like to travel together without worries or cares. Last year's party was a glorious success. Sailing May 30th; landing in Italy; motoring through Italy, Austria, Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland and Belgium. Passion Play included. Two and a half delightful months. Entire cost less than $1,550.00. References exchanged. Address E. D. K., 277 West 12th St., New York City.

EUROPE
33 DAYS $295
Foremost Student Tours
Nearly 4000 satisfied members in 1929
250 All Expense Tours
Small groups, 1st class hotels, more motor travel. Visit the Passion Play of 1930. *Send for booklet.*
COLLEGE TRAVEL CLUB
154 Boylston St. Boston, Mass.

LANGUAGES

FRENCH, SPANISH, ITALIAN, GERMAN, ENGLISH
Conversational method, Carefully selected Native teachers. Private lessons, 75c, short course, 9 to 9 daily, 18th year.
FISHER'S SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES
1264 Lexington Avenue, N. W. Cor. 85th St.

POSITIONS WANTED

Young man, university graduate, two years public school teaching, successful with the handicapped child, wishes connection with school, or as tutor. Address: Box 482, The New Republic.

A woman of thirty, by profession a teacher of art and creative writing, desires an entertaining and lucrative summer position. Address: Box 483, The New Republic.

Intelligent and cultured couple, both teachers, who really know the out-of-doors, have gardening experience and are exceptionally handy, desire interesting summer occupation together or separately. Address: Box 484, The New Republic.

A teacher carrying fair recommendations from his present progressive, elementary school appointment, desires to be considered toward some secondary or primary school vacancy next year. Address: Box 487, The New Republic.

HELP WANTED

SECRETARY: unusually interesting permanent position, New York; for college graduate, under thirty, with social science training and still alive above neck. Must be excellent secretary. Write immediately full details. Box 486, The New Republic.

BOOKS

THE BOOKS YOU CAN'T GET ELSEWHERE
may be rented for a nominal fee. Members throughout the United States have access to a large collection of rare, scarce, out-of-print, strange and curious books; limited, privately-printed editions, unabridged translations and extraordinary new books. Please state occupation or profession when writing for information and lists.

Esoterika Biblion Society
45 West 45th Street, Dep't C-2 New York City

THAT BOOK YOU WANT!
We hold 2,000,000 of the best books—new, second-hand, out-of-print, rare—all subjects. Also Sets of Authors. Catalogue free (25 issued). Outline requirements and interests. Books sent on approval. **FOYLES, Charing Cross Rd., London, England.**

The ANSWER to "PROFITS"
by Thorwald Siegfried

An original, scientific, realistic analysis of problems stated in the book *"PROFITS,"* 87 p., $1, Postpaid. *READY SOON:* "9 Dillars vs. 1 Dollar, $1, Postpaid. "Essays on Waste, Work and War," $1, Postpaid.

THE WIGWAM PRESS
130 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

GENERAL

REAL HARRIS TWEED
The aristocrats of all sports wear—direct from makers. Sample free. Suit-lengths by Mail. Carriage Paid.
NEWALL, 159 Stornoway, Scotland.

The Perennial Questions

soon will be up with all of us with vacation time, fast approaching: What to do? Where to do it? Thousands of New Republic readers will be asking them and looking for an answer—in the columns of The New Republic, first and preferably. Your summer place, your cottage or bungalow, your inn or farm may be just the thing they're looking for.

For the special rate apply

THE
NEW REPUBLIC
421 W. 21st St., N.Y.C.
CHElsea 8393

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED